

FEDERAL REGISTER

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES
OF THE UNITED STATES
1934

VOLUME 25 NUMBER 47

Washington, Wednesday, March 9, 1960

Contents

Agricultural Marketing Service

NOTICES:

Farris Livestock Auction Yard et al.; posted stockyards..... 2036

RULES AND REGULATIONS:

Canned lima beans; U.S. standard for grades; color..... 2005

Agriculture Department

See Agricultural Marketing Service; Commodity Credit Corporation; Commodity Stabilization Service.

Civil Aeronautics Board

NOTICES:

Hearings, etc.:

Aerovias Ecuatorianas, C.A. 2022
Fort Worth investigation..... 2021
Modern Air Transport, Inc., and John P. Becker enforcement proceeding..... 2022
Pacific Air Lines, Inc..... 2021
West Coast Airlines, Inc..... 2022

Civil and Defense Mobilization Office

NOTICES:

Powers, Dr. Philip N.; appointee's statement of business interests..... 2036

Civil Service Commission

RULES AND REGULATIONS:

Exceptions from competitive service:

Justice Department..... 2005
Labor Department..... 2005

Commodity Credit Corporation

RULES AND REGULATIONS:

Limitation of nonrecourse price support for 1960 crop of price supported field crops in surplus supply; inclusion of additional crops..... 2005

Commodity Stabilization Service

RULES AND REGULATIONS:

Allotment of the direct-consumption portion of 1960 mainland sugar quota for Puerto Rico.... 2006

Federal Aviation Agency

PROPOSED RULE MAKING:

Federal airways, control areas and reporting points (3 documents) - 2017, 2018

RULES AND REGULATIONS:

Federal airways, continental control area, control areas, control zones, reporting points, and positive control route segments; designations (7 documents) - 2009-2011

Federal Communications Commission

NOTICES:

Hearings, etc.:

Antennavision Service Co., Inc.. 2022
Idaho Microwave, Inc..... 2022
KDEF Broadcasting Co..... 2022
Morrow Radio Manufacturing Co. and Ray E. Morrow..... 2023
Stevenson, Alvin W..... 2023
WDUL Television Corp. (WHYZ-TV)..... 2023
Western Union Telegraph Co. and Postal Telegraph, Inc.... 2023
Mexican broadcast stations; list of changes, proposed changes, and correction in assignments.. 2023

PROPOSED RULE MAKING:

Table of assignments; television broadcast stations:
Prescott, Ariz..... 2019
Waycross, Ga..... 2019

RULES AND REGULATIONS:

Table of assignments; television broadcast stations; Marinette-Green Bay, Wis..... 2012

Food and Drug Administration

PROPOSED RULE MAKING:

Tolerances and exemptions from tolerances for pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities..... 2017

Health, Education, and Welfare Department

See Food and Drug Administration; Social Security Administration.

Interior Department

See also Mines Bureau.

NOTICES:

Delegations of authority..... 2036

Interstate Commerce Commission

NOTICES:

Motor carriers:

Alternate route deviation notices..... 2025
Applications and certain other proceedings..... 2025
Transfer proceedings..... 2024

Mines Bureau

PROPOSED RULE MAKING:

Dust collectors for use in connection with rock drilling in coal mines..... 2014

Social Security Administration

RULES AND REGULATIONS:

Disclosure of information for purposes relating to aid to dependent children..... 2011

(Continued on next page)

Codification Guide

A numerical list of the parts of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published in this issue. Proposed rules, as opposed to final actions, are identified as such.

A Cumulative Codification Guide covering the current month appears at the end of each issue beginning with the second issue of the month.

5 CFR

6 (2 documents) ----- 2005

6 CFR

477 ----- 2005

7 CFR

52 ----- 2005

815 ----- 2006

14 CFR

600 (7 documents) ----- 2009-2011

601 (7 documents) ----- 2009-2011

PROPOSED RULES:

600 (3 documents) ----- 2017, 2018

601 (3 documents) ----- 2017, 2018

20 CFR

401 ----- 2011

21 CFR

PROPOSED RULES:

120 ----- 2017

30 CFR

PROPOSED RULES:

33 ----- 2014

47 CFR

3 ----- 2012

PROPOSED RULES:

3 (2 documents) ----- 2019

Announcement

CFR SUPPLEMENTS

(As of January 1, 1960)

The following Supplements are now available:

Title 7, Parts 1-50 ----- \$0.45

Title 26, Parts 170-221 ----- 2.25

Previously announced: Title 3 (\$0.60); Titles 4-5 (\$1.00); Title 7, Parts 51-52 (\$0.45); Parts 53-209 (\$0.40); Title 8 (\$0.40); Title 32, Parts 700-799 (\$1.00); Title 36, Revised (\$3.00); Title 46, Parts 146-149, Revised (\$6.00)

Order from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.



Republic 7-7500

Extension 3261

Published daily, except Sundays, Mondays, and days following official Federal holidays, by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act, approved July 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C., ch. 8B), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President. Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

The FEDERAL REGISTER will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for \$1.50 per month or \$15.00 per year, payable in advance. The charge for individual copies (minimum 15 cents) varies in proportion to the size of the issue. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

The regulatory material appearing herein is keyed to the CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS, which is published, under 50 titles, pursuant to section 11 of the Federal Register Act, as amended August 5, 1953. The CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of books and pocket supplements vary.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the FEDERAL REGISTER, or the CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

Rules and Regulations

Title 5—ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Chapter I—Civil Service Commission

PART 6—EXCEPTIONS FROM THE COMPETITIVE SERVICE

Department of Labor

Effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER, paragraph (e)(1) is added to § 6.113 as set out below.

§ 6.113 Department of labor.

* * * * *

(e) *Bureau of Labor-Management Reports.* (1) The Chief of the Division of National Investigations and the 10 top supervisory-investigator positions in the Division of National Investigations.

(R.S. 1753, sec. 2, 22 Stat. 403, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 631, 633)

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,

[SEAL] MARY V. WENZEL,

Executive Assistant.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2160; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:47 a.m.]

PART 6—EXCEPTIONS FROM THE COMPETITIVE SERVICE

Department of Justice

Effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER, subparagraphs (2) of subparagraphs (m) and (n) of § 6.308 are redesignated as subparagraphs (3), new subparagraphs (2) and (4) are added to paragraph (m) and a new subparagraph (2) is added to paragraph (n). As revised, paragraphs (m) and (n) will read as follows:

§ 6.308 Department of Justice.

* * * * *

(m) *Bureau of Prisons.* (1) The Director.

(2) The Deputy Director.

(3) Three Assistant Directors.

(4) Technical and Legislative Adviser.

(n) *Federal Prison Industries, Inc.*

(1) The Commissioner of Industries.

(2) The Deputy Commissioner of Industries.

(3) Associate Commissioner.

(R.S. 1753, sec. 2, 22 Stat. 403, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 631, 633)

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,

[SEAL] MARY V. WENZEL,

Executive Assistant.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2159; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:47 a.m.]

Title 6—AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

Chapter IV—Commodity Stabilization Service and Commodity Credit Cor- poration, Department of Agriculture

[Amtd. 1]

PART 477—PRICE SUPPORT LIMITATION

Subpart—Regulations Relating to the \$50,000 Limitation of Nonrecourse Price Support for the 1960 Crop of Price Supported Field Crops in Sur- plus Supply

INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL CROPS

Basis and purpose. The purpose of this amendment is to make the above identified regulations applicable to cottonseed, flaxseed, oats, and soybeans. These crops have been declared by the Secretary to be in surplus supply for purposes of the \$50,000 limitation on nonrecourse price support on 1960 production. The limitation on price support is contained in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1960, P.L. 86-80.

The Regulations Relating to the \$50,000 Limitation on Nonrecourse Price Support for the 1960 Crop of Price Supported Field Crops in Surplus Supply are amended as follows:

1. Section 477.102 is amended to read as follows:

§ 477.102 Applicability.

The provisions of §§ 477.101 to 477.114 apply severally to the 1960 crops of barley, corn, flaxseed, grain sorghums, oats, rice, rye, soybeans, and wheat; upland cotton, extra long staple cotton and cottonseed; peanuts; and the following kinds of tobacco: flue-cured, types 11-14; fire-cured, types 22-23; fire-cured, type 21; Burley, type 31; Maryland, type 32, dark air-cured, types 35-36; Virginia sun-cured, type 37; cigar filler and cigar binder, types 42-44 and 53-55; cigar filler, type 46; and cigar binder, types 51-52.

§ 477.103 [Amendment]

2. Section 477.103 is amended by adding the following new paragraph (o) at the end thereof:

(o) "Acreage devoted to cottonseed" shall be the sum of the acreages devoted to upland cotton and extra long staple cotton for the particular crop year.

(Pub. Law 86-80)

Done at Washington, D.C., this 3d day of March 1960.

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2154; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

Title 7—AGRICULTURE

Chapter I—Agricultural Marketing Service (Standards, Inspections, Marketing Practices), Department of Agriculture

PART 52—PROCESSED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES, PROCESSED PROD- UCTS THEREOF, AND CERTAIN OTHER PROCESSED FOOD PROD- UCTS

Subpart—United States Standards for Grades of Canned Lima Beans¹

COLOR

Pursuant to the authority contained in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (secs. 202-208, 60 Stat. 1087, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1621-1627), the United States Standards for Grades of Canned Lima Beans (§§ 52.471-52.484) are hereby amended as follows:

Delete paragraph (a) (1), (2), (3), and (4) of § 52.479 Color, and substitute therefor the following:

§ 52.479 Color.

(a) *General.* (1) The color for all types of canned lima beans in this subpart is based on the predominating and characteristic color of the exterior surface of the canned lima bean when compared to the U.S.D.A. permanent plastic color standards for Canned Thin-Seeded Lima Beans.

(2) A set of these color standards is available for public inspection, and information in regard to procurement of sets may be obtained from the Processed Products Standardization and Inspection Branch, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D.C.

(i) "Green" with respect to all types of canned lima beans in this subpart means that the color of the individual lima bean possesses as much or more green color than the "U.S.D.A. Color Standard for Canned Thin-Seeded Green Lima Beans".

¹ Compliance with the provisions of these standards shall not excuse failure to comply with the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or with applicable State laws and regulations.

(ii) "White" with respect to all types of canned lima beans in this subpart means that the color of the individual lima bean is lighter than the "U.S.D.A. Color Standard for Canned Thin-Seeded White Lima Beans".

Notice of proposed rule making, public procedure thereon, and the postponement of the effective date of this amendment beyond that herein specified (5 U.S.C. 1001-1011) are impractical, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest in that:

(1) The U.S.D.A. color standards cited in this amendment are permanent plastic colors which supersede the applicable printed color illustrations in Maerz and Paul's Dictionary of Color;

(2) For industry guidance this amendment should become effective prior to the 1960 processing season for canned lima beans;

(3) This action is necessary for purposes of providing a means of uniform application and interpretation of color classification in the inspection of the product; and

(4) Compliance with the provisions of this amendment will not require any special preparation on the part of the industry that can not be completed by the effective date.

(Secs. 202-208, 60 Stat. 1087, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1621-1627)

Dated March 4, 1960, to become effective March 20, 1960.

ROY W. LENNARTSON,
Deputy Administrator,
Marketing Services.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2161; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:47 a.m.]

Chapter VIII—Commodity Stabilization Service (Sugar), Department of Agriculture

SUBCHAPTER B—SUGAR REQUIREMENTS AND QUOTAS

[Sugar Reg. 815]

PART 815—ALLOTMENT OF THE DIRECT-CONSUMPTION PORTION OF 1960 MAINLAND SUGAR QUOTA FOR PUERTO RICO

Basis and purpose. This allotment order is issued under section 205(a) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (herein called the "act") for the purpose of allotting the portion of the 1960 sugar quota for Puerto Rico which may be filled by direct-consumption sugar among persons who market such sugar for consumption in the continental United States.

Preliminary statement. Under the provisions of section 205(a) of the act, the Secretary is required to allot a quota or proration thereof whenever he finds that allotment is necessary (1) to assure an orderly and adequate flow of sugar or liquid sugar in the channels of interstate or foreign commerce, (2) to prevent the disorderly marketing of sugar or liquid sugar, (3) to maintain a continuous and stable supply of sugar or liquid sugar, or (4) to afford all interested persons an equitable opportunity

to market sugar or liquid sugar within the quota for the area. Section 205(a) also provides that such allotment shall be made after such hearing upon such notice as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe.

Pursuant to the applicable rules of practice and procedure (7 CFR 801.1 et seq), a preliminary finding was made that allotment of the direct-consumption portion of the quota is necessary and a notice was published on October 9, 1959 (24 F.R. 8239) of a public hearing to be held at Santurce, Puerto Rico, in the Conference Room, Caribbean Area Office, ASC, Segarra Building, on November 5, 1959, at 10:00 a.m., for the purpose of receiving evidence to enable the Secretary to make a fair, efficient and equitable distribution of the direct-consumption portion of the 1960 mainland sugar quota for Puerto Rico. The hearing was held at the time and place specified in the notice.

Based upon the record of the hearing and pursuant to the applicable rules of practice and procedure, the Administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service, United States Department of Agriculture, on February 4, 1960, filed a recommended decision and proposed order with respect to the allotment of the 1960 direct-consumption portion of the mainland sugar quota for Puerto Rico with the Hearing Clerk, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D.C. Notice of such filing and opportunity to file exceptions thereto (24 F.R. 987) was given to all interested persons in the manner provided in the rules of practice and procedure.

In arriving at the findings, conclusions, and regulatory provisions of this order, all proposed findings and conclusions were carefully and fully considered in conjunction with the record evidence pertaining to the allotment of the direct-consumption portion of the mainland quota. To the extent that findings and conclusions proposed by interested persons are inconsistent with the findings and conclusions contained herein, the specific or implied requests to make such findings and reach such conclusions are denied on the basis of the facts found and stated in connection with the conclusions herein set forth.

At the time of the hearing and the issuance of the Recommended Decision relating to this allotment order, data pertaining to 1959 calendar year marketings of allottees contained estimates. Final data have subsequently become available, have been made a part of the official records of the Department and are herein substituted for estimates of such data as provided for in the findings and conclusions.

Effective date. The proceeding to which this order relates was instituted for the purpose of allotting the direct-consumption portion of the mainland quota to prevent disorderly marketing and to afford each interested person an equitable opportunity to market direct-consumption sugar in the continental United States. Some of the allotments made by this order are small and delay in the issuance of the order might result in some persons marketing more than

their fair share of the direct-consumption portion of the quota. Therefore, it is imperative that this order become effective on the earliest possible date in order to fully effectuate the purposes of section 205(a) of the act. Accordingly, it is hereby found that compliance with the 30-day effective date requirement of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) is impracticable and contrary to the public interest and, consequently, this order shall be effective when published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Basis for findings and conclusions. Section 205(a) of the act reads in pertinent part as follows:

* * * Allotments shall be made in such manner and in such amounts as to provide a fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of such quota or proration thereof, by taking into consideration the processing of sugar or liquid sugar from sugar beets or sugarcane to which proportionate shares, determined pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 302, pertained; the past marketings or importations of each such person and the ability of such person to market or import that portion of such quota or proration thereof allotted to him * * *

The record of the hearing regarding the subject of this order shows that the capacity to produce refined sugar in Puerto Rico far exceeds the maximum quantity of Puerto Rican direct-consumption sugar that may be marketed within the prospective 1960 mainland and local quotas of approximately 255,000 to 270,000 short tons, raw value. Thus, to prevent disorderly marketing of sugar and to afford all interested persons an equitable opportunity to market sugar within the quota as required by section 205(a) of the act, allotment of the direct-consumption portion of the mainland sugar quota for Puerto Rico has been found to be necessary (R. 9, 10).

While all three factors specified in the provisions of section 205(a) of the act quoted above have been considered, only the "past marketings" and ability to market factors have been given percentile weightings in the formula on which the allotment of the direct-consumption portion of the 1960 mainland quota for Puerto Rico is based. Testimony indicates that allottees accounting for over 93 percent of the direct-consumption sugar brought into the continental United States do not process sugar from sugarcane and that giving weight to the factor "processing from proportionate shares" would not lead to equitable allotments (R. 10).

The government witness proposed that the factor "past marketings" be measured for each processor and refiner by the average annual quantity of direct-consumption sugar which he marketed in the continental United States within the mainland quotas for Puerto Rico during the five years 1955 through 1959, inclusive, expressed as a percentage of the sum of such quantities for all processors and refiners (R. 11). The witness stated that the use of the quantities marketed in the most recent five-year period will reflect market conditions similar to those which would be expected to occur in the marketing of direct-consumption sugar in the mainland in

1960, and furthermore that a five-year average of such marketings tends to minimize shortrun influences affecting data for a single year and adds stability to the "past marketings" factor (R. 11, 12).

The government witness proposed that the factor "ability to market" be measured by the largest quantity of direct-consumption sugar marketed in the mainland by each refiner and processor in any one of the past five years, 1955 through 1959, expressed as a percentage of the sum of such quantities for all refiners and processors (R. 12). The witness stated that marketings of direct-consumption sugar in the recent period, 1955 through 1959, are considered to be a more effective measure of processor's and refiner's relative ability to market sugar in 1960 than are their marketings in a more remote period (R. 12, 13).

In determining allotments of the direct-consumption portion of the mainland quota for 1960 the government witness proposed that the factors "past marketings" and "ability to market" be weighted equally as was done in establishing past allotments of the quota (R. 13). Further testimony indicated that the need for a reserve for the marketing of raw sugar within the direct-consumption portion of the mainland quota appears to be practically non-existent (R. 13, 14). Accordingly, it was proposed that the entire quantity which may be brought into the continental United States within the 1960 mainland quota for Puerto Rico be allotted by applying 50 percent weight to each of the factors "past marketings" and "ability to market" measure for each allottee as indicated in the preceding paragraphs.

At the hearing no other proposals were submitted, however, subsequent to the hearing and prior to November 20, 1959, Central Roig Refining Company, in a brief, proposed that the factor of ability to market be measured by the largest quantity of direct-consumption sugar marketed in the mainland by each refiner in any one of the 15 years, 1945 through 1959. Data relating to marketings of direct-consumption sugar to the mainland prior to 1948 are not included in the record of this hearing.

A copy of the brief filed by the Central Roig Refining Company was sent to all interested parties and the period for submission of briefs was extended to December 10, 1959. Prior to such date two briefs were submitted in which Western Sugar Refining Company concurred with the proposal of Central Roig Refining Company and Porto Rican American Sugar Refinery, Inc., concurred with the government proposal made at the hearing.

In determining ability to market, the performance of allottees as reflected in actual shipments of direct-consumption sugar to the mainland is considered the best and most practical measure. The use of the most recent five-year period provides a sufficient period of time for allottees to demonstrate ability to market. The largest quantity marketed by an allottee in any one year during such a recent period would be more indicative of current relative ability to market

than the highest year's marketings in a more remote period. On the basis of the hearing record it appears there has been no impairment in recent years in the capacity of the production facilities of the allottees that are subject to the allotment order issued pursuant to this proceeding. The use of the period 1945-59 as a measure of ability would include years immediately after World War II in which marketing conditions are less representative of conditions to be faced in 1960 and marketings in the early years of this period would be less indicative of relative ability to market sugar in 1960 than the most recent five-year period. Furthermore, the proration of allotment deficits during four of the last five years provided additional marketing opportunities to allottees who demonstrated ability to utilize additional allotments. In view of the foregoing, the method of measuring the factor "ability to market" proposed by the government has been adopted in preference to the measure of such factor as proposed by Central Roig Refining Company.

In accordance with the record of the hearing (R. 18) provision has been made in the findings and the order to revise allotments without further notice or hearing for purposes of (1) giving effect to the substitution of revised estimates or final data for estimates of the quantity of direct-consumption sugar imported into the continental United States by each allottee in 1959, (2) allocating any quantity of an allotment released by an allottee to other allottees or to a reserve for "All other persons" when written notification of such release is received by the Department, and (3) giving effect to any change in the direct-consumption portion of the mainland quota. Also, as proposed in the record (R. 22), the findings and order contain provisions relating to restrictions on marketing similar to those contained in the 1959 Puerto Rican allotment order since such provisions operated successfully in 1959 and no objection was made in the record to their inclusion.

The record of the hearing discloses that South Puerto Rico Sugar Corporation did not market direct-consumption sugar in the mainland during the period

1948 through 1959 and that no appearance was made on behalf of such company to request an allotment and that no evidence was introduced in the record to support an allotment for that corporation. Consequently, the record of the hearing provides no basis for South Puerto Rico Sugar Corporation to receive an allotment of the 1960 quota.

At the hearing testimony was given to the effect that the name of Porto Rican American Sugar Refinery, Inc., has been changed officially to Puerto Rican American Sugar Refinery, Inc. (R. 29).

Findings and conclusions. On the basis of the record of the hearing I hereby find and conclude that:

(1) The potential capacity of Puerto Rican processors and refiners to produce direct-consumption sugar during the calendar year 1960 is about 320,000 short tons and this quantity is far greater than the total quantity of such sugar which may be marketed within the 1960 sugar quotas for Puerto Rico.

(2) The allotment of the direct-consumption portion of the 1960 mainland sugar quota for Puerto Rico is necessary to prevent disorderly marketings of such sugar and to afford each interested person an equitable opportunity to market such sugar in the continental United States.

(3) Assignment of percentile weight to the "processing from proportionate shares" factor in the allotment formula would not result in fair, efficient and equitable allotments.

(4) The "past marketings" factor shall be measured by each allottee's percentage of the average entries of direct-consumption sugar by all allottees in the continental United States during the years 1955 through 1959.

(5) The "ability to market" factor shall be measured for each allottee by expressing each allottee's largest entries of direct-consumption sugar into the United States during any one of the past five years, 1955 through 1959, as a percent of the sum of such entries for all allottees.

(6) The quantities of sugar and percentages referred to in paragraphs (4) and (5), above, based on final data, are set forth in the following table:

Allottee	Average annual marketings, 1955-59		Highest annual marketings, 1955-59	
	Short tons, raw value	Percent of total	Short tons, raw value	Percent of total
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Central Aguirre Sugar Co., a trust.....	6,298	4.8088	6,931	4.9057
Central Roig Refining Co.....	20,047	15.3067	21,365	15.1220
Central San Francisco.....	1,382	1.0552	1,591	1.1261
Puerto Rican American Sugar Refinery, Inc.....	82,397	62.9133	88,891	62.9166
Western Sugar Refining Co.....	20,845	15.9160	22,506	15.9295
Total.....	130,969	100.0000	141,284	100.0000

(7) Allotments totaling the direct-consumption portion of the 1960 Puerto Rican mainland quota should be established by giving fifty percent weight to past marketings, measured as provided in paragraph (4), above, and fifty percent weight to ability to market, measured as provided in paragraph (5), above.

(8) This order may be revised without further notice or hearing for the purpose of substituting revised estimates or final data for previous estimates of the Puerto Rican direct-consumption sugar entries by and on behalf of each allottee in 1959 when such revised or final data become part of the official records of the Department.

(9) This order shall be revised without further notice or hearing to revise allotments to give effect to any change in the direct-consumption portion of the 1960 quota for Puerto Rico on the same basis as is provided in these findings for establishing allotments.

(10) This order shall require each allottee to submit to the Department in writing in the following form, no later than October 1, 1960, an estimate of the maximum quantity of direct-consumption sugar he will be able to market during the quota year within any allotment, and a release for allocation to other allottees as an allotment deficit of quantities of sugar in excess of such maximum quantity:

I, the undersigned allottee, estimate that I will be able to market not to exceed _____ short tons, commercial weight, equivalent to _____ short tons, raw value, of sugar during the entire calendar year 1960 within any allotment of the direct-consumption portion of the 1960 mainland quota for Puerto Rico which may be established for me pursuant to S.R. 815.

I release for disposition under the provisions of S.R. 815 the portion of any allotment in excess of the above stated quantity of sugar, and any quantity of sugar which would increase my allotment in excess of such stated amount as a result of either the allotment of any increases in the direct-consumption portion of the Puerto Rican sugar quota or the allocation of any quantities of sugar released by one or more other allottees, occurring in either case, from the date of this release until the end of the calendar year.

An allottee may revise a previous notice of the maximum quantity he may market during the quota year and a previous release of allotment deficit by submitting to the Department on the prescribed form a new notice of the maximum quantity he may market during the quota year and a new release of allotment deficit. A revised notice and release may be given effect only to the extent that the allotment of any other allottee will not be reduced solely thereby as provided in Finding (11).

(11) This order shall provide for allotment without further notice or hearing of any quantity of sugar that may be released by an allottee as provided in Finding (10) when quantities of sugar become available for allotment.

In revising allotments for the purpose of giving effect to a quota increase or decrease, or to give effect to a release by an allottee, allotment deficits shall be determined and allocated without regard to any previous determination and proration of deficits and such deficits shall be allocated proportionately among other allottees to the extent they are able to utilize additional allotments, on the basis of allotments computed for such allottees without including allocation of any allotment deficits: *Provided*, That, the allotment previously in effect for an allottee which includes a deficit proration shall not be reduced solely to give effect to a revised notice received from another allottee subsequent to such deficit proration and which notice increases the declared maximum quantity such other allottee is able to market. Such deficit allocations to any allottee

shall be limited in accordance with the written statement of the maximum quantity he will market submitted as provided in Finding (10). In the event the total of allotment deficits released by allottees exceeds the total quantity which can be utilized by other allottees, the excess quantity shall be allotted to a reserve for "All other persons".

(12) Official notice will be taken of (a) written notice to the Department by an allottee of the estimated maximum marketings of such allottee within an allotment and of the quantities of sugar released for reallocation when the notification becomes a part of the official records of the Department, (b) estimated and final data for 1959 calendar year marketings of sugar for direct-consumption on the mainland that become a part of the official records of the Department, and (c) any regulation issued by the Secretary which changes the direct-consumption portion of the 1960 mainland quota for Puerto Rico.

(13) Each allottee in 1960 shall be restricted from bringing into the continental United States for consumption therein any direct-consumption sugar in excess of the smaller of his allotment established herein or the sum of the quantity of sugar produced by the allottee from sugarcane grown in Puerto Rico and the quantity of sugar acquired from Puerto Rican processors by the allottee in 1960 for shipment to the mainland within the applicable 1960 mainland quota for Puerto Rico. All other persons shall be prohibited from bringing direct-consumption sugar into the continental United States in 1960 for consumption therein except such sugar acquired in 1960 from an allottee within his allotment established herein or sugar brought in within an unallotted reserve which may be established for "All other persons". All persons collectively shall be prohibited from bringing into the continental United States any direct-consumption sugar other than crystalline sugar in excess of the quantity by which the direct-consumption portion of the mainland quota exceeds 126,033 short tons, raw value.

(14) To facilitate full and effective use of allotments, provision shall be made in the order for transfer of allotments under circumstances of a succession of interest.

(15) Allotments established in the foregoing manner and the amounts set forth in the order provide a fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of the direct-consumption portion of the mainland quota, as required by section 205(a) of the act.

Order. Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture by section 205(a) of the act, and in accordance with the findings and conclusions heretofore made, it is hereby ordered:

§ 815.1 Allotment of the direct-consumption portion of 1960 mainland sugar quota for Puerto Rico.

(a) *Allotments.* The direct-consumption portion of the 1960 sugar quota for Puerto Rico, amounting to 139,161 short

tons, raw value, is hereby allotted as follows:

Allottee:	Direct-consumption allotment (short tons, raw value)
Central Aguirre Sugar Co., a trust..	6,759
Central Roig Refining Co.....	21,173
Central San Francisco.....	1,518
Puerto Rican American Sugar Rfy., Inc.....	87,553
Western Sugar Refining Co.....	22,158
All other persons.....	0
Total	139,161

(b) *Restrictions on marketing.* (1) During the calendar year 1960 each allottee named in paragraph (a) of this section is hereby prohibited from bringing into the continental United States within an allotment established for such allottee, for consumption therein, any direct-consumption sugar from Puerto Rico in excess of the smaller of (i) the allotment therefor established in paragraph (a) of this section, or (ii) the sum of the quantity of sugar produced by the allottee from sugarcane grown in Puerto Rico, and the quantity of sugar produced from Puerto Rican sugarcane which was sugar acquired by the allottee in 1960 for further processing and shipment within the direct-consumption portion of the 1960 mainland quota for Puerto Rico.

(2) During the calendar year 1960 all persons other than the allottees specified in paragraph (a) of this section are hereby prohibited from bringing into the continental United States, for consumption therein, any direct-consumption sugar from Puerto Rico except that acquired from an allottee within the quantity limitations established in subparagraph (1) of this paragraph and that brought in within any unallotted reserve that may be established for "All other persons".

(3) Of the total quantity of direct-consumption sugar allotted in paragraph (a) of this section, 126,033 short tons, raw value, may be filled only by sugar principally of crystalline structure and the balance may be filled by sugar whether or not principally of crystalline structure.

(c) *Notice of maximum marketing capabilities and release of quantities in excess thereof.* Each allottee shall notify the Department no later than October 1, 1960, of the maximum quantity of sugar he will be able to market within any allotment of the direct-consumption portion of the mainland quota during the quota year, and shall release any quantity of sugar in excess of the maximum amount stated on the notice. Such a notice and release should be submitted as provided in Finding (10) accompanying this order.

(d) *Revision of allotments.* The Director of the Sugar Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, is hereby authorized to revise the allotments established under this order without further notice or hearing to give effect to (1) the substitution of revised estimates or final data for estimates, (2) the allocation, as provided in Finding (11) accompanying this

order, of any quantity of sugar released by an allottee and (3) any increase or decrease in the direct-consumption portion of the 1960 mainland quota for Puerto Rico as provided in Finding (9) accompanying this order.

(e) *Transfer of marketing rights under allotments.* The Director of the Sugar Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, of the Department, consistent with the provisions of the Act, may permit a quantity of sugar produced from sugarcane grown in Puerto Rico to be brought into the continental United States for direct-consumption therein by one allottee, or other person, within the allotment or portion thereof established for another allottee upon relinquishment by the latter allottee of an equivalent quantity of his allotment and upon receipt of evidence satisfactory to the Secretary that a merger, consolidation, transfer of sugar-processing facilities, or other action of similar effect upon the allottees or persons involved has occurred.

(Sec. 403, 61 Stat. 932; 7 U.S.C. 1153. Interpretations or applies secs. 205, 209; 61 Stat. 926, 928; 7 U.S.C. 1115, 1119)

Done at Washington, D.C., this 3d day of March 1960.

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2155; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:47 a.m.]

Title 14—AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

Chapter III—Federal Aviation Agency

SUBCHAPTER E—AIR NAVIGATION REGULATIONS

[Airspace Docket No. 59-LA-58]

[Amdt. 252]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

[Amdt. 292]

PART 601—DESIGNATION OF THE CONTINENTAL CONTROL AREA, CONTROL AREAS, CONTROL ZONES, REPORTING POINTS, AND POSITIVE CONTROL ROUTE SEGMENTS

Modification of Federal Airways and Associated Control Areas

On December 12, 1959, a notice of proposed rule-making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (24 F.R. 10080) stating that the Federal Aviation Agency proposed to modify VOR Federal airways No. 4, 89, and 207 and the control areas associated with Victor 207.

No adverse comments were received regarding the proposed amendments.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the rules herein adopted, and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

The substance of the proposed amendments having been published, therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530)

and for the reasons set forth in the notice, § 600.6004 (24 F.R. 10504, 10142); § 600.6089 (24 F.R. 10514, 9986); § 600.6207 (24 F.R. 10522); and § 601.6207 (24 F.R. 10603); are amended as follows:

§ 600.6004 [Amendment]

1. In the text of § 600.6004 *VOR Federal airway No. 4 (Seattle, Wash., to Herndon, Va.)*, delete "including a north alternate via the intersection of the Laramie omnirange 131° True and the Denver omnirange 016° True radials;" and substitute therefor "including a north alternate from the Laramie VOR to the Denver VOR via the Gill, Colo., VOR;"

§ 600.6089 [Amendment]

2. In the text of § 600.6089 *VOR Federal airway No. 89 (Denver, Colo., to Rapid City, S. Dak.)*, delete "including an east alternate via the INT of the Denver VOR 016° and the Cheyenne VOR 131° radials;" and substitute therefor "including an east alternate from the Denver VOR to the Cheyenne VOR via the Gill, Colo., VOR and the INT of the Gill VOR 003° T and the Cheyenne VOR 131° T radials;"

3. Section 600.6207 is amended to read:

§ 600.6207 VOR Federal airway No. 207 (Denver, Colo., to Scottsbluff, Nebr.).

From the Denver, Colo., VOR via the Gill, Colo., VOR to the Scottsbluff, Nebr., VOR.

4. Section 601.6207 is amended to read:

§ 601.6207 VOR Federal airway No. 207 control areas (Denver, Colo., to Scottsbluff, Nebr.).

All of VOR Federal airway No. 207.

These amendments shall become effective 0001 e.s.t. May 5, 1960.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of
Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2139; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:45 a.m.]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-213]

[Amdt. 202]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

[Amdt. 224]

PART 601—DESIGNATION OF THE CONTINENTAL CONTROL AREA, CONTROL AREAS, CONTROL ZONES, REPORTING POINTS, AND POSITIVE CONTROL ROUTE SEGMENTS

Modification of Federal Airways and Reporting Points

On October 29, 1959, a notice of proposed rule-making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (24 F.R. 8801) stating that the Federal Aviation Agency was proposing to modify the segment of VOR

Federal airway No. 8 from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Martinsburg, W. Va.; to modify the starting point of VOR Federal airway No. 268, and to redescribe the associated Domestic VOR reporting points, Scottsdale, Pa., and Flint Stone, Md., intersections.

No adverse comments were received regarding the proposed amendments.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the rules herein adopted, and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

Pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530) and for the reasons set forth in the notice, the proposed amendments are hereby adopted without change and set forth below:

1. In the text of § 600.6008 *VOR Federal airway No. 8 (Long Beach, Calif., to Washington, D.C.)*, delete "Pittsburgh, Pa., omnirange station;" and substitute therefor "Pittsburgh, Pa., VOR; Indian Head, Pa., VOR;"

2. In the text of § 600.6268 *VOR Federal airway No. 268 (Flint Stone, Md., to Baltimore, Md.)*, delete "From the point of INT of the Front Royal, Va., VOR 335° and the Martinsburg, W. Va., VOR 298° radials" and substitute therefor, "From the point of INT of the Grantsville, Md., VOR 082° T and the Martinsburg, W. Va., VOR 297° T radials".

3. In § 601.7001 *Domestic VOR reporting points:*

(a) Scottsdale Intersection is amended to read: Scottsdale Intersection: The INT of the Pittsburgh, Pa., VOR 120° T and the Uniontown, Pa., VOR 018° T radials.

(b) Flint Stone Intersection is amended to read: Flint Stone Intersection: The INT of the Grantsville, Md., VOR 082° T and the Martinsburg, W. Va., VOR 297° T radials.

These amendments shall become effective 0001 e.s.t. May 5, 1960.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of
Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2140; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:45 a.m.]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-284]

[Amdt. 238]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

[Amdt. 282]

PART 601—DESIGNATION OF THE CONTINENTAL CONTROL AREA, CONTROL AREAS, CONTROL ZONES, REPORTING POINTS, AND POSITIVE CONTROL ROUTE SEGMENTS

Extension of Federal Airway and Associated Control Areas

On December 12, 1959, a notice of proposed rule making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (24 F.R. 10080)

stating that the Federal Aviation Agency proposed to extend VOR Federal airway No. 50 westerly from St. Joseph, Mo., to Pawnee City, Nebr.

No adverse comments were received regarding the proposed amendments.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the rules herein adopted, and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

The substance of the proposed amendments having been published, therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530) and for reasons set forth in the notice, § 600.6050 (24 F.R. 10511) and § 601.6050 (24 F.R. 10599) are amended as follows:

1. Section 600.6050 *VOR Federal airway No. 50 (St. Joseph, Mo., to Dayton, Ohio)*:

(a) In the caption delete "(St. Joseph, Mo., to Dayton, Ohio)." and substitute therefor "(Pawnee City, Nebr., to Dayton, Ohio)."

(b) In the text delete "From the St. Joseph, Mo., VOR via the Kirksville, Mo., VOR;" and substitute therefor "From the Pawnee City, Nebr., VOR via the St. Joseph, Mo., VOR; Kirksville, Mo., VOR;".

2. In the caption of § 601.6050 *VOR Federal airway No. 50 control areas (St. Joseph, Mo., to Dayton, Ohio)*, delete "(St. Joseph, Mo., to Dayton, Ohio)." and substitute therefor "(Pawnee City, Nebr., to Dayton, Ohio)."

These amendments shall become effective 0001 e.s.t., May 5, 1960.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of
Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2141; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-393]

[Amdt. 234]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

[Amdt. 277]

PART 601—DESIGNATION OF THE CONTINENTAL CONTROL AREA, CONTROL AREAS, CONTROL ZONES, REPORTING POINTS, AND POSITIVE CONTROL ROUTE SEGMENTS

Revocation of a Segment of Federal Airway and Associated Control Areas, Extension of Federal Airway and Associated Control Areas, and Modification of Control Area Extension

On December 10, 1959, a notice of proposed rule-making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (24 F.R. 9997) stating that the Federal Aviation Agency proposed the revocation of a segment of VOR Federal airway No. 107 between

Oakland, Calif., VOR and Red Bluff, Calif., VOR; the extension of VOR Federal airway No. 199 from Ukiah, Calif., VOR to the Red Bluff VOR, and the re-description of the San Francisco, Calif., control area extension.

No adverse comments were received regarding these amendments.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the rules herein adopted, and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

The substance of the proposed amendments having been published, therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530) and for the reasons set forth in the notice, §§ 600.6107 (24 F.R. 10515), 600.6199 (24 F.R. 10521), and §§ 601.6107 (24 F.R. 10601), 601.6199 (24 F.R. 10603) and 601.1113 (24 F.R. 10525) are amended as follows:

§ 600.6107 [Amendment]

1. Section 600.6107 *VOR Federal airway No. 107 (Los Angeles, Calif., to Red Bluff, Calif.)*:

(a) In the caption delete "(Los Angeles, Calif., to Red Bluff, Calif.)" and substitute therefor "(Los Angeles, Calif., to Oakland, Calif.)."

(b) In the text delete "Oakland, Calif., omnirange station; intersection of the Oakland omnirange 330° True and the Ukiah omnirange 147° True radials; Ukiah, Calif., omnirange station; to the Red Bluff, Calif., omnirange station." and substitute therefor "to the Oakland, Calif., VORTAC."

2. Section 600.6199 is amended to read:

§ 600.6199 *VOR Federal airway No. 199 (San Francisco, Calif., to Red Bluff, Calif.)*.

From the San Francisco, Calif., VOR via the INT of the San Francisco VOR 304° T and the Ukiah VOR 172° T radials; the Ukiah, Calif., VOR; to the Red Bluff, Calif., VORTAC. The portion of this airway which lies within the geographic limits of, and between the designated altitudes of, the Tomales Point Restricted Area (R-519) is excluded during the time of designation of this restricted area.

3. Section 601.6107 is amended to read:

§ 601.6107 *VOR Federal airway No. 107 control areas (Los Angeles, Calif., to Oakland, Calif.)*.

All of VOR Federal airway No. 107.

4. Section 601.6199 is amended to read:

§ 601.6199 *VOR Federal airway No. 199 control areas (San Francisco, Calif., to Red Bluff, Calif.)*.

All of VOR Federal airway No. 199.

5. Section 601.1113 is amended to read:

§ 601.1113 *Control area extension (San Francisco, Calif.)*.

All of the airspace in the San Francisco area bounded by a line beginning

at latitude 38°15'00" N., longitude 122°37'00" W.; to latitude 37°43'34" N., longitude 122°13'21" W.; to latitude 37°27'20" N., longitude 121°50'30" W.; to latitude 37°00'55" N., longitude 122°17'15" W.; thence N along the 3 nautical mile line off-shore to latitude 37°12'20" N., longitude 122°28'00" W.; to latitude 37°14'00" N., longitude 122°24'55" W.; to latitude 38°08'30" N., longitude 122°54'00" W.; thence to the point of beginning.

These amendments shall become effective 0001 e.s.t. May 5, 1960.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of
Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2142; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:45 a.m.]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-WA-217]

[Amdt. 194]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

[Amdt. 214]

PART 601—DESIGNATION OF THE CONTINENTAL CONTROL AREA, CONTROL AREAS, CONTROL ZONES, REPORTING POINTS, AND POSITIVE CONTROL ROUTE SEGMENTS

Designation of Federal Airway and Associated Control Areas

On October 7, 1959, a notice of proposed rule-making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (24 F.R. 8119) stating that the Federal Aviation Agency proposed to designate VOR Federal airway No. 474, and its associated control areas, from Bellaire, Ohio, to Lancaster, Pa.

No adverse comments were received regarding the proposed amendment.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the rules herein adopted, and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

Pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530) and for the reasons stated in the notice, the proposed amendments are hereby adopted without change and set forth below:

§ 600.6474 *VOR Federal airway No. 474 (Bellaire, Ohio, to Lancaster, Pa.)*.

From the Bellaire, Ohio, VOR via the Indian Head, Pa., VOR; St. Thomas, Pa., VOR; to the Lancaster, Pa., VOR.

§ 601.6474 *VOR Federal airway No. 474 control areas (Bellaire, Ohio, to Lancaster, Pa.)*.

All of VOR Federal airway No. 474.

These amendments shall become effective 0001 e.s.t. May 5, 1960.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of
Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2143; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:45 a.m.]

[Airspace Docket No. 60-WA-11]

[Amdt. 231]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

[Amdt. 274]

PART 601—DESIGNATION OF THE CONTINENTAL CONTROL AREA, CONTROL AREAS, CONTROL ZONES, REPORTING POINTS, AND POSITIVE CONTROL ROUTE SEG- MENTS

Modification of Federal Airways, Con- trol Area Extensions and Desig- nated Reporting Points

The purpose of these amendments to §§ 600.6003, 600.6051, 600.6295, 601.1036, 601.1427 and 601.7001 of the regulations of the Administrator is to change the name of the Biscayne, Fla., VOR to the Biscayne Bay, Fla., VOR. The change has already been effected on charts.

Since this action imposes no additional burden on the public, compliance with the notice, public procedure, and effective date requirements of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act is unnecessary.

In consideration of the foregoing, and pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530) § 600.6003 (24 F.R. 10503); § 600.6051 (24 F.R. 10511, 10876, 25 F.R. 629); § 600.6295 (24 F.R. 10525); § 601.1036 (24 F.R. 10548); § 601.1427 (24 F.R. 10569); and § 601.7001 (24 F.R. 10606) are amended as follows:

1. In the text of § 600.6003 *VOR Federal airway No. 3 (Key West, Fla., to Presque Isle, Maine)*, delete "Biscayne" and substitute therefor "Biscayne Bay" wherever it appears.

2. In the text of § 600.6051 *VOR Federal airway No. 51 (Key West, Fla., to Chicago, Ill.)*, delete "Biscayne" and substitute therefor "Biscayne Bay" wherever it appears.

3. In the text of § 600.6295 *VOR Federal airway No. 295 (Miami, Fla., to Cross City, Fla.)*, delete "Biscayne" and substitute therefor "Biscayne Bay" wherever it appears.

4. In the text of § 601.1036 *Control area extension (West Palm Beach, Fla.)*, delete "Biscayne" and substitute therefor "Biscayne Bay" wherever it appears.

5. In the text of § 601.1427 *Control area extension (Miami, Fla.)*, delete "Biscayne" and substitute therefor "Biscayne Bay" wherever it appears.

6. In the text of § 601.7001 *Domestic VOR reporting points*, delete "Biscayne, Fla., omnirange station." and substitute therefor "Biscayne Bay, Fla., VOR."

These amendments shall become effective upon the date of publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of
Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2144; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:45 a.m.]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-FW-42]

[Amdt. 237]

PART 600—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS

[Amdt. 281]

PART 601—DESIGNATION OF THE CONTINENTAL CONTROL AREA, CONTROL AREAS, CONTROL ZONES, REPORTING POINTS, AND POSITIVE CONTROL ROUTE SEG- MENTS

Revocation of Segment of Federal Air- way, Associated Control Area, and Designated Reporting Point

On December 12, 1959, a notice of proposed rule-making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (24 F.R. 10078) stating that the Federal Aviation Agency proposed to revoke the segment of Green Federal airway No. 4 and its associated control areas between Amarillo, Tex., and Wichita, Kans., and also the Gage, Okla., radio range station as a reporting point.

No comments were received regarding the proposed amendments.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of the rules herein adopted, and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

The substance of the proposed amendment having been published, therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (24 F.R. 4530) and for the reasons set forth in the notice, §§ 600.14 (24 F.R. 10493), 601.14 (24 F.R. 10543), 601.4014 (24 F.R. 10592) are amended as follows:

1. Section 600.14 *Green Federal airway No. 4 (Los Angeles, Calif., to Philadelphia, Pa.)*:

(a) In the caption, delete "(Los Angeles, Calif., to Philadelphia, Pa.)" and substitute therefor "(Los Angeles, Calif., to Amarillo, Tex., and Wichita, Kans., to Philadelphia, Pa.)"

(b) In the text, delete "Amarillo, Tex., radio range station; the intersection of the east course of the Amarillo, Tex., radio range and the southwest course of the Gage, Okla., radio range; Gage, Okla., radio range station; Wichita, Kans., radio range station; Kansas City, Mo., radio range station;" and substitute therefor "to the Amarillo, Tex., RR. From the Wichita, Kans., RR via Kansas City, Mo., RR;"

2. In the caption, § 601.14 *Green Federal airway No. 4 control areas (Los Angeles, Calif., to Philadelphia, Pa.)*, delete "(Los Angeles, Calif., to Philadelphia, Pa.)" and substitute therefor "(Los Angeles, Calif., to Amarillo, Tex.,

and Wichita, Kans., to Philadelphia, Pa.)"

3. Section 601.4014 *Green Federal airway No. 4 (Los Angeles, Calif., to Philadelphia, Pa.)*:

(a) In the caption, delete "(Los Angeles, Calif., to Philadelphia, Pa.)" and substitute therefor "(Los Angeles, Calif., to Amarillo, Tex., and Wichita, Kans., to Philadelphia.)"

(b) In the text, delete "Gage, Okla., radio range station;"

These amendments shall become effective 0001 e.s.t. May 5, 1960.

(Secs. 307(a), 313(a), 72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of
Air Traffic Management.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2145; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:46 a.m.]

Title 20—EMPLOYEES' BENEFITS

Chapter III—Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

[Reg. 1, Further Amended]

PART 401—DISCLOSURE OF OF- FICIAL RECORDS AND INFORMA- TION

Disclosure of Information for Purposes Relating to Aid to Dependent Chil- dren

1. Section 401.3(g)(1) of Social Security Administration Regulation No. 1 is amended to read:

§ 401.3 Information which may be disclosed and to whom.

(g)(1) To any officer or employee of an agency of a State Government lawfully charged with the administration of a program receiving grants-in-aid under titles I, V, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act, information regarding benefits paid or entitlement to benefits under title II of the Social Security Act and, if it has been determined, the date of birth of a recipient or applicant, and also whether a period of disability has been established for such recipient or applicant, the beginning and ending date of such period, and the date determined to be the date of onset of such disability, where such information is necessary to enable the agency to determine the eligibility of or the amount of benefits or services due such recipient or applicant. Medical information relating to an individual may be furnished for such a purpose to such an officer or employee only upon consent of such individual and of the source of such information or, if such source is not available, of a physician in the employ of the Department.

2. Section 401.3(g) is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph (3) to read as follows:

(3) To any officer or employee of an agency of a State government lawfully charged with the administration of a program receiving grants-in-aid under title IV of the Social Security Act, the information specified in subparagraph (1) of this paragraph and in addition, in accordance with requirements and procedures issued from time to time by the Bureau of Public Assistance of the Social Security Administration, information concerning the whereabouts of a deserting parent of a child eligible for Aid to Dependent Children under a program receiving grants-in-aid under title IV of the Social Security Act.

3. The foregoing amendments shall become effective upon date of publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

(Sec. 205(a), 53 Stat. 1368 as amended, sec. 1102, 49 Stat. 647 as amended, sec. 1106, 64 Stat. 559; 42 U.S.C. 405(a), 1302, 1306; sec. 5 of Reorg. Plan No. 1 of 1953, 67 Stat. 18. 18. Assistance sec. 1106, 64 Stat. 559; 42 U.S.C. 1306)

[SEAL] W. L. MITCHELL,
Commissioner of Social Security.

Approved: March 2, 1960.

BERTHA S. ADKINS,
Acting Secretary of Health,
Education, and Welfare.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2152; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:46 a.m.]

Title 47—TELECOMMUNICATION

Chapter I—Federal Communications Commission

[Docket No. 13304; FCC 60-195]

PART 3—RADIO BROADCAST SERVICES

Table of Assignments, Television Broadcast Stations; Marinette-Green Bay, Wis.

1. The Commission has before it for consideration its Notice of Proposed Rule Making, released in this proceeding on December 11, 1959 (FCC 59-1251), inviting comments on the proposal of M & M Broadcasting Company, licensee of Station WLUK-TV (formerly Station WMBV-TV) on Channel 11 at Marinette, Wisconsin, to shift Channel 11 from Marinette to Green Bay, Wisconsin.

2. Petitioner, M & M Broadcasting Company, and American Broadcasting Company filed comments in support of the proposal.¹ M & M also requests that its outstanding license for Station WLUK-TV be modified to specify operation on Channel 11 at Green Bay instead of Marinette at the time the reallocation proposal is adopted. The Federal Aviation Agency filed a statement in opposition to the proposed amendment. M & M filed reply comments.

3. Channel 11 at Marinette could be reassigned to Green Bay and meet all allocation spacing requirements of the

rules. Station WLUK-TV, which now operates on Channel 11 at Marinette, could also qualify for operation on Channel 11 at Green Bay without any change in transmitter site or its presently authorized facilities since from its present antenna site near Flintville, Wisconsin, approximately 38 miles southwest of Marinette and 14 miles northeast of Green Bay, it now provides a principal city signal over all of Green Bay, as well as Marinette. Station WLUK-TV formerly operated from a transmitter site about 14 miles southwest of Marinette. Since September 16, 1959, it has been operating from the Flintville site, with maximum power (316 kw.) and antenna height above average terrain of 980 feet (1722' MSL, 962' AG).² Station WLUK-TV's present site was approved by the Airspace Panel of the Air Coordinating Committee, and the antenna height presently authorized for Station WLUK-TV is less than that approved by the Airspace Panel for the station at this location.³

4. While M & M seeks no change in its presently authorized technical facilities in connection with the subject rule making proceeding except a paper change in its outstanding authorization designating Green Bay instead of Marinette as the location of the station, it has on file a pending application to increase its tower and antenna height above average terrain at its present transmitter site by 330 feet (BMPCT-5325), and to make other changes in its technical facilities. This proposal to increase tower height was objected to by the Federal Aviation Agency and the Departments of the Navy and Army and was disapproved by the Airspace Panel of the Air Coordinating Committee in Washington, D.C., on April 28, 1959 (Case 11702, 594th meeting). Thereafter, the Commission decided a hearing was necessary to enable it to determine whether a grant of M & M's application would serve the public interest, and on September 10, 1959, M & M's application to increase tower height was designated for hearing in Docket No. 13186 to determine whether the proposed antenna structure would constitute a hazard to air navigation and whether, in light of the evidence adduced on that issue, a grant of the application would serve the public interest. The hearing in Docket No. 13186 is now scheduled to commence on March 22, 1960. M & M, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Departments of the Navy and Army are parties to the proceeding.

5. In its comments filed in the subject proceeding, FAA states that it has no objection to the reallocation of Channel 11 from Marinette to Green Bay as such. It proposes, however, that, if the channel shift is made, Station WLUK-TV be required to move its antenna to the Green Bay "antenna farm" area approximately 7½ miles to the southeast of Green Bay

where both Green Bay stations are located and that antenna heights in the "antenna farm" area be limited to that approved for the other Green Bay stations—a maximum of 1,916 feet MSL. In the alternative, FAA urges that Station WLUK-TV be limited at its present location to a maximum antenna height of 989 feet above ground (1,749 feet MSL). FAA indicates in its comments that airspace approval of Station WLUK-TV's present site and antenna height required a compromise in air safety in order to enable the station to provide the required principal city signal to Marinette but that, if Channel 11 is assigned to Green Bay, there is no reason why the station should not locate its transmitter in the "antenna farm" area where the other Green Bay stations have their transmitters and where the penalty to air safety at the Flintville site would be eliminated. M & M objects to the consideration or finalization of the alternate conditions proposed by FAA on the use of Channel 11 at Green Bay in the subject rule making proceeding.

6. In light of the scheduled adjudicatory proceeding in Docket No. 13186 on the particular effect on air safety of M & M's pending application to increase Station WLUK-TV's antenna height, we believe it unnecessary and undesirable to consider in this rule making proceeding the merits of FAA's alternative proposals to condition M & M's use of Channel 11 if allocated to Green Bay because of air safety considerations. The evidence adduced in that proceeding will enable us to determine whether air safety considerations warrant the increase in tower height proposed for Station WLUK-TV at its present site, and the decision we reach from the record on that question will necessarily have a bearing on the need for consideration in further adjudicatory proceedings of any requirement that Station WLUK-TV relocate its antenna in the recommended Green Bay "antenna farm" area. Under these circumstances, and considering that the proposed shift of Channel 11 from Marinette to Green Bay raises no new question of aviation safety if Station WLUK-TV remains at its present site and its authorized antenna height is not changed, we believe we should confine our consideration to this proposal in the subject rule making proceeding.

7. The Green Bay-Marquette area is presently dependent for television service upon three VHF stations. Two of these stations, Station WBAY-TV on Channel 2 and Station WFRV on Channel 5, operate on VHF channels assigned to Green Bay, the largest city in this area. Green Bay had a 1950 population of 52,735 and a metropolitan area population of 98,314. The third station is petitioner's Station WLUK-TV which operates on Channel 11, assigned to Marinette. Marinette is a small community—its 1950 population was but 14,178—located about 45 miles to the north of Green Bay. All three stations provide Green Bay with city grade coverage, but only Station WLUK-TV provides Marinette with city grade coverage. Marinette does, however, lie well within the Grade B contours of both Green Bay stations. There are no other VHF assignments available in this area, and with all of the available UHF chan-

² Pursuant to BPCT-2524 (Docket No. 12598), granted February 25, 1959, as modified by BMPCT-5306, granted May 8, 1959.

¹ Attached to M & M's comments are copies of letters previously received by the Commission from the City Council of Marinette and Senator Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin which support the shift of Channel 11 from Marinette to Green Bay.

³ The antenna height approved was 989' AG at 1749' MSL. Letter dated July 16, 1958, from Airspace Panel of the Air Coordinating Committee re action taken at meeting held July 15, 1958 (559th meeting).

nels assigned in the area still unused and no applications pending therefor, it appears that this area must continue to rely solely upon its three existing stations for television service for some time to come.

8. While Station WLUK-TV has served as the local outlet for Marinette since 1954, petitioner stresses that, in order to survive, its station has had to operate as a regional station serving and looking to its entire coverage area for support, and particularly to the greater populations of the Fox River Valley, which include Green Bay. In doing so, Station WLUK-TV has had to compete with the two Green Bay stations, which serve approximately 95 percent of the populations within its present Grade B service area. M & M claims that Station WLUK-TV, as a Marinette station, has always been seriously handicapped in competing for audience, programming and advertising revenues (local, regional and national) with its Green Bay competitors because of their identification and operation on channels assigned to the major and most important city in the common market area of all three stations. It states that although Station WLUK-TV has strived to overcome this handicap over the years by improved facilities, programming and coverage, and is continuing to do so, all its efforts only palliate and cannot solve its problem of achieving a reasonably supportable competitive status as against its Green Bay competitors as long as it remains a Marinette station.

9. In a statement attached to petitioner's comments, Station WLUK-TV's general manager, who has held that position with the station since 1954, attests that great numbers of the station's sales efforts have been unsuccessful solely because the station was allocated and identified with the small city of Marinette and that national, regional, and most local advertisers in many, if not most, cases give strong preference to the Green Bay stations solely because they are allocated at and identified with the major city in the market. Both M & M and its station manager concede that Station WLUK-TV does not suffer this competitive disadvantage with respect to Marinette-only advertisers but point out that, despite the station's best efforts, in a recent and typical month, revenues from local sales to Marinette-only accounts totaled only 6 percent of the station's total revenues from all national, regional and local sales. M & M also asserts that it lost its affiliation with the NBC network in 1959 to one of its Green Bay competitors (Station WFRV-TV) due to WLUK-TV's not being allocated to and primarily identified with Green Bay; that it must bear substantial operating burdens in both cities that are not borne by its Green Bay competitors, and that making Station WLUK-TV a Green Bay station by reallocation of Channel 11 is indispensable to its achievement of a reasonably effective competitive status in the Green Bay-Marquette market that will support its continued full operations in the public interest.

10. M & M states that Station WLUK-TV has been a losing proposition finan-

cially since it first went on the air; that its overall operating losses from 1954 have now risen to a total of more than \$200,000, and that, even though it is now operating from its new Flintville site with improved facilities and greater coverage, its losses are on the increase. During the period of September through December, 1959, it points out that its operating loss totalled over \$20,000, which was larger than for similar periods. Unless its station is able to improve its position in the Green Bay-Marquette market by the proposed channel shift, M & M urges that it will continue to languish in its handicapped position as the "poor third" outlet in this market, largely irrespective of management, programming and sales efforts, and that the continuation of full, or any, WLUK-TV operations will be jeopardized.

11. The Marinette City Council is also of the view that Station WLUK-TV is now seriously handicapped, as a Marinette station, in competing for programming or a common listing with its Green Bay competitors and that the reallocation of Channel 11 to Green Bay is necessary to permit Station WLUK-TV and the network with which it is affiliated to compete effectively in the Green Bay-Marquette market.

12. ABC states that Station WLUK-TV is now its outlet for the entire Green Bay-Marquette area, and, to fulfill this function properly, the station must be competitive with the Green Bay stations. It urges that despite the fact that Station WLUK-TV has achieved substantial competitive equality with the Green Bay stations in terms of coverage and quality of signal in the major population center of the market with the establishment of its new transmitting facilities, the station continues to be at a competitive disadvantage because of its continued assignment to and identification with Marinette instead of Green Bay, the principal city in its service area; and that this disadvantage attaches to ABC as well, and handicaps it in competing with the other national networks, who are affiliated with the Green Bay stations. ABC asserts that the experience of the networks and national spot representatives demonstrates that in this and similar situations, irrespective of the technical coverage provided, the identification of a station with a minor community of a national television market adversely affects the sale of time to network and national spot advertisers, and that in the case of Station WLUK-TV, it also handicaps it in seeking local advertising revenues in Green Bay.

13. We are convinced from our consideration of this reallocation proposal and the showing made by its advocates that the public interest would be served by its adoption. With no foreseeable prospect of additional television services in the Green Bay-Marquette area, it is exceedingly important in the public interest that the existing services be as effective and as comparable competitively as possible. It is our opinion that this objective can be most fully realized if the three existing outlets in this area are all primarily identified with Green Bay, the largest and principal city in the

service areas of all three stations. The reallocation of Channel 11 at Marinette to Green Bay will make this possible. While such action requires the deletion of the only VHF assignment and local outlet in the small community of Marinette, we believe it warranted in order to insure the preservation of Channel 11 service to Marinette and throughout the Green Bay area and to promote more effective competition among the stations and networks serving the area.

14. Authority for the adoption of the amendment proposed herein is contained in sections 4(i), 301, 303 (c), (d), (f), and (r), and 307(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

15. In view of the foregoing: *It is ordered*, That, effective April 8, 1960, the Table of Assignments, contained in § 3.606 of the Commission's rules and regulations is amended, insofar as the communities named are concerned, to read as follows:

City:	Channel No.
Marinette, Wis.-----	32-, *38+.
Green Bay, Wis.-----	2+, 5+, 11+, 70+.

16. We also conclude that the public interest would be served by insuring continuance of Channel 11 service to the Marinette-Green Bay area without interruption. We are, therefore, modifying M & M Broadcasting Company's authorization for Station WLUK-TV to specify operation on Channel 11+ at Green Bay instead of Marinette. The transmitter site now used by Station WLUK-TV conforms to all technical requirements for operation on Channel 11+ at Green Bay and making this frequency available to M & M at Green Bay will require no interruption in its present service to Marinette and the Green Bay area.

17. Accordingly: *It is further ordered*, That effective April 8, 1960, pursuant to section 316(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, the outstanding authorization held by M & M Broadcasting Company for Station WLUK-TV is modified to specify operation on Channel 11 at Green Bay instead of Marinette, Wisconsin, subject to the following conditions:

(a) M & M Broadcasting Company should advise the Commission in writing by April 8, 1960, whether it accepts the modification of its authorization for operation of Station WLUK-TV at Green Bay; and

(b) M & M Broadcasting Company should submit to the Commission by April 8, 1960, all necessary information for the preparation of a modified authorization specifying Green Bay, Wisconsin, as Station WLUK-TV's location.

(Sec. 4, 48 Stat. 1066, as amended; 47 U.S.C. 154. Interpret or apply secs. 301, 303, 307, 48 Stat. 1081, 1082, 1083; 47 U.S.C. 301, 303, 307)

Adopted: March 2, 1960.

Released: March 4, 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,

[SEAL] MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2178; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:49 a.m.]

Proposed Rule Making

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Mines

[30 CFR Part 33]

[Bureau of Mines Schedule 25B]

DUST COLLECTORS FOR USE IN CONNECTION WITH ROCK DRILLING IN COAL MINES

Procedures for Testing for Permissibility

There was published in the *FEDERAL REGISTER* of September 3, 1959 (24 F.R. 7135), a notice and text of a proposed revision of the regulations, governing the testing, approval, and certification of dust collectors for use in connection with rock drilling in coal mines. Interested persons were allowed 30 days after publication to submit comments, suggestions, or objections. After consideration of the views and data received from the interested public, desirable changes are so extensive as to justify publication of a second notice of proposed rule making to permit further public consideration thereof.

Pursuant to section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 238; 5 U.S.C. 1003(a)), notice is hereby given that under authority contained in sec. 5, 36 Stat. 370, as amended, 30 U.S.C. 7; and sec. 1, 66 Stat. 709, 30 U.S.C. 482(a); it is proposed to revise the regulations in Part 33, Chapter I of Title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, as set forth below.

The principal revisions are: Format changed, a single certificate of approval covers a dust collector with electrical components, testing procedure modified to eliminate conformance of requirements of electrical parts operated outby last open crosscuts, provisions included for issuing certificates of performance for dust-collecting systems, fees revised, and definitions are extended to include the foregoing changes.

In accordance with the policy of the Department of the Interior, interested persons may submit written comments, suggestions, or objections with respect to the proposed revision to the Director, Bureau of Mines, Washington 25, D.C., within 30 days after the date of publication in the *FEDERAL REGISTER*.

MARLING J. ANKENY,
Director.

Approved March 3, 1960.

ELMER F. BENNETT,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

Part 33, Chapter I of Title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, would be revised to read as follows:

Subpart A—General Provisions

Sec.
33.1 Purpose.

2014

- Sec.
33.2 Definitions.
33.3 Consultation.
33.4 Types of dust collectors for which certificates of approval may be granted.
33.5 Fees for investigation.
33.6 Applications.
33.7 Date for conducting tests.
33.8 Conduct of investigations, tests, and demonstrations.
33.9 Certification of dust-collecting systems.
33.10 Certificates of approval or performance.
33.11 Approval plates.
33.12 Changes after certification.
33.13 Withdrawal of certification.

Subpart B—Dust-Collector Requirements

- 33.20 Design and construction.
33.21 Modification of test equipment.
33.22 Mode of use.
33.23 Mechanical positioning of parts.

Subpart C—Test Requirements

- 33.30 Test site.
33.31 Test space.
33.32 Determination of dust concentration.
33.33 Allowable limits of dust concentration.
33.34 Drilling test.
33.35 Methods of drilling; dust-collector unit.
33.36 Methods of drilling; combination unit or dust-collecting system.
33.37 Test procedure.
33.38 Electrical parts.

AUTHORITY: §§ 33.1 to 33.38 issued under sec. 5, 36 Stat. 370, as amended; 30 U.S.C. 7, 482(a). Interpret or apply secs. 2, 3, 36 Stat. 370, as amended, secs. 201, 209, 66 Stat. 692, 703; 30 U.S.C. 3, 5, 471, 479.

Subpart A—General Provisions

§ 33.1 Purpose.

The regulations in this part set forth the requirements for dust collectors used in connection with rock drilling in coal mines to procure their certification as permissible for use in coal mines; procedures for applying for such certification; and fees.

§ 33.2 Definitions.

As used in this part:

(a) "Permissible," as applied to a dust collector, means that it conforms to the requirements of this part, and that a certificate of approval to that effect has been issued.

(b) "Bureau" means the United States Bureau of Mines.

(c) "Certificate of approval" means a formal document issued by the Bureau stating that the dust collector unit or combination unit has met the requirements of this part, and authorizing the use and attachment of an official approval plate or a marking so indicating.

(d) "Certificate of performance" means a formal document issued by the Bureau stating that a dust-collecting system has met the test requirements of Subpart C of this part and therefore is suitable for use as part of permissible units.

(e) "Dust-collector unit" means a complete assembly of parts comprising apparatus for collecting the dust that results from drilling in rock in coal mines, and is independent of the drilling equipment.

(f) "Combination unit" means a rock-drilling device with an integral dust-collecting system, or mining equipment with an integral rock-drilling device and dust-collecting system.

(g) "Dust-collecting system" means an assembly of parts comprising apparatus for collecting the dust that results from drilling in rock and is dependent upon attachment to other equipment for its operation.

(h) "Applicant" means an individual, partnership, company, corporation, association, or other organization that designs and manufactures, assembles or controls the assembly of a dust-collecting system, dust-collector unit, or a combination unit, and seeks certification thereof.

§ 33.3 Consultation.

By appointment, applicants or their representatives may visit the Bureau's Central Experiment Station, 4800 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania, and discuss with qualified Bureau representatives proposed designs of equipment to be submitted in accordance with the requirements of the regulations of this part. No charge is made for such consultation and no written report thereof will be submitted to the applicant.

§ 33.4 Types of dust collectors for which certificates of approval may be granted.

(a) Certificates of approval will be granted only for completely assembled dust-collector or combination units; parts or subassemblies will not be approved.

(b) The following types of equipment may be approved: Dust-collector or combination units having components designed specifically to prevent dissemination of airborne dust generated by drilling into coal-mine rock strata in concentrations in excess of those hereinafter stated in § 33.33 as allowable, and to confine or control the collected dust in such manner that it may be removed or disposed of without dissemination into the mine atmosphere in quantities that would create unhygienic conditions.

§ 33.5 Fees for investigation.

(a) The following fees are charged for inspecting, testing, and certifying dust collectors:

- | | |
|---|------|
| (1) Preliminary review of drawings, specifications, and related data, each unit or system..... | \$50 |
| (2) Detailed inspection to determine adequacy of design and materials, each unit or system..... | 50 |

- (3) Detailed inspection to determine adequacy of design and materials relating to changes subsequent to an initial investigation, per man day or fraction thereof ----- ¹\$35
- (4) Drilling each set of 10 test holes:
 - (i) First set of 10 test holes drilled, per investigation ----- 135
 - (ii) Each additional set of 10 test holes drilled, per investigation ----- 75
- (5) Final examination and recording of drawings and specifications, and issuing certificate of approval or certificate of performance ----- 65
- (6) Examination and recording of drawings and specifications, and issuing extension of certificate of approval or certificate of performance ----- ²\$50
- (7) Design of approval plate or P/T label for certified equipment --- 25

¹In addition the applicant shall reimburse the Bureau for necessary travel and subsistence expenses of its representative(s) according to "Standardized Government Travel Regulations" when such Bureau representative(s) is required to be away from official headquarters.

²If only a nominal amount of work is required, the fee will be \$20.

(b) Additional fees shall be charged in accordance with the provisions of Part 18 of Subchapter D of this chapter (Bureau of Mines Schedule 2, revised, the current revision of which is Schedule 2F) for examining and testing electrical parts of dust collectors required under § 33.38.

(c) The full fee must accompany an application for certification of a unit or dust-collecting system. The fees charged for each investigation will be in proportion to the work done, and any surplus will be refunded to the applicant.

(d) The fee for an extension of certification to cover modifications of equipment will be determined according to the work required and the applicant will be notified accordingly. The fee must be paid in advance before the investigation will be undertaken.

(e) If the applicant is uncertain as to the amount of fee that should be sent with his application, the information will be furnished him in writing upon request addressed to the Central Experiment Station, 4800 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania, Attention: Chief, Branch of Health Research.

§ 33.6 Applications.

(a) No investigation or testing will be undertaken by the Bureau except pursuant to a written application, in duplicate (except as otherwise provided in paragraph (e) of this section), accompanied by a check, bank draft, or money order, payable to the United States Bureau of Mines, to cover the fees; and all prescribed drawings, specifications, and related materials. The application and all related matters and all correspondence concerning it shall be sent to the Central Experiment Station, Bureau of Mines, 4800 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania, Attention: Chief, Branch of Health Research.

(b) The application shall specify the operating conditions (see § 33.22) for which certification is requested.

(c) Shipment of the equipment to be tested shall be deferred until the Bureau has notified the applicant that the application will be accepted. Shipping instructions will be issued by the Bureau and shipping charges shall be prepaid by the applicant. Upon completion of the investigation and notification thereof to the applicant by the Bureau, the applicant shall remove his equipment promptly from the test site (see § 33.30).

(d) Drawings and specifications shall be adequate in number and detail to identify fully the design of the unit or system and to disclose its materials and detailed dimensions of all component parts. Drawings must be numbered and dated to insure accurate identification and reference to records, and must show the latest revision. Specifications and drawings, including a complete assembly drawing with each part that affects dust collection identified thereon, shall include:

(1) Details of all dust-collecting parts. A manufacturer who supplies the applicant with component parts or subassemblies may submit drawings and specifications of such parts or subassemblies direct to the Bureau instead of to the applicant. If the unit or system is certified, the Bureau will supply the applicant with a list, in duplicate, of drawing numbers pertaining to such parts or subassemblies for identification purposes only.

(2) Details of the electrical parts of units designed to operate as face equipment (see § 33.38) in accordance with the provisions of Part 18 of Subchapter D of this chapter (Bureau of Mines Schedule 2, revised, the current revision of which is Schedule 2F).

(3) Storage capacity of the various stages of dust collection in the dust separator.

(4) Net filter area in the dust separator, and complete specifications of the filtering material.

(e) If an application is made for certification of a dust-collector unit or a combination unit that includes electrical parts, and is designed to operate as electric face equipment, as defined in § 33.38, the application shall be in triplicate. One copy of the application shall be marked Attention: Chief, Branch of Electrical-Mechanical Testing.

(f) The application shall state that the unit or system is completely developed and of the design and materials which the applicant believes to be suitable for a finished marketable product.

(g) The applicant shall furnish a complete unit or system for inspection and testing. Spare parts, such as gaskets and other expendable components subject to wear in normal operation, shall be supplied by the applicant to permit continuous operation during test periods. If special tools are necessary to disassemble any part for inspection or test, they shall be furnished by the applicant.

(h) Each unit or system shall be carefully inspected before it is shipped from the place of manufacture or assembly and the results of the inspection shall be recorded on a factory-inspection form. The applicant shall furnish the Bureau

with a copy of the factory-inspection form with his application. The form shall direct attention to the points that must be checked to make certain that all parts are in proper condition, complete in all respects, and in agreement with the drawings and specifications filed with the Bureau.

(i) With the application the applicant shall furnish the Bureau with complete instructions for operating and servicing the unit or system and information as to the kind of power required. After the Bureau's investigation, if any revision of the instructions is required a revised copy thereof shall be submitted to the Bureau for inclusion with the drawings and specifications.

§ 33.7 Date for conducting tests.

The date of acceptance of an application will determine the order of precedence for testing when more than one application is pending, and the applicant will be notified of the date on which tests will begin. If a unit or system fails to meet any of the requirements, it shall lose its order of precedence. If an application is submitted to resume testing after correction of the cause of failure, it will be treated as a new application and the order of precedence for testing will be so determined.

§ 33.8 Conduct of investigations, tests, and demonstrations.

(a) Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval or performance, only Bureau personnel, representatives of the applicant, and such other persons as may be mutually agreed upon, may observe the investigations or tests. The Bureau shall hold as confidential and shall not disclose principles or patentable features, nor shall it disclose any details of drawings, specifications, and related materials. After the issuance of a certificate, the Bureau may conduct such public demonstrations and tests of the unit or system as it deems appropriate. The conduct of all investigations, tests, and demonstrations shall be under the sole direction and control of the Bureau, and any other persons shall be present only as observers, except as noted in paragraph (b) of this section.

(b) When requested by the Bureau, the applicant shall provide assistance in disassembling parts for inspection, preparing parts for testing, and operating combination units.

§ 33.9 Certification of dust-collecting systems.

Manufacturers of dust-collecting systems that are designed for integral use on machines with drilling equipment may apply to the Bureau to issue a certificate of performance for such systems. To qualify for a certificate of performance, the dust-collecting system shall have met satisfactorily the test requirements of Subpart C of this part under specified operating conditions (such as type of drilling equipment, drilling speed, and power requirements) and the construction thereof shall be adequately covered by specifications and drawings officially recorded and filed with the Bureau. Individual parts of dust-collecting systems will not be cer-

tified for performance. Certificates of performance may be cited to fabricators of combination units as evidence that further inspection and testing of the dust-collecting system will not be required, provided the dust-collecting requirements of the drilling equipment do not exceed the limits of performance for which the system was certified. Since the Bureau does not sanction the use of the words "permissible" or "approved" except as applying to completely assembled equipment, dust-collecting systems, which have been certified only as to performance, shall not be advertised or labeled in a manner inferring that such systems themselves are permissible or approved by the Bureau. However, a certified system may be advertised as suitable for use on combination units for which certification may be desired if the limits of its performance are cited. Certified dust-collecting systems shall bear labels or tags which shall contain the following: "Performance-tested Dust Collecting System, Bureau of Mines File No. P/T -----" and name of manufacturer, identifying numbers of the dust-collector parts, and description of the limitations for which performance is certified. The Bureau will assign a P/T file number in the certification letter.

§ 33.10 Certificates of approval or performance.

(a) Upon completion of an investigation, the Bureau will issue to the applicant either a certificate or a written notice of disapproval, as the case may require. No informal notification of approval will be issued. If a certificate is issued, no test data or detailed results of tests will accompany it. If a notice of disapproval is issued, it will be accompanied by details of the defects, with a view to possible correction. The Bureau will not disclose, except to the applicant, any information on a unit or system upon which a notice of disapproval has been issued.

(b) A certificate will be accompanied by a list of the drawings and specifications covering the details of design and construction of the unit or system, including the electrical parts, if applicable, upon which the certificate is based. Applicants shall keep exact duplicates of the drawings and specifications submitted and the list of drawing numbers referred to in subparagraph 1 of paragraph (d) of § 33.6 that relate to the certified unit or system, and these are to be adhered to exactly in production.

§ 33.11 Approval plates.

(a) A certificate of approval will be accompanied by a photograph of a design for an approval plate, bearing the seal of the Bureau of Mines, the name of the applicant, the name of the unit, the approval number or space for the approval number (or numbers if permissibility of electrical parts is involved), spaces for the type and the serial numbers of the unit, conditions of approval, and identifying numbers of the dust-collector parts. When deemed necessary by the Bureau, an appropriate statement shall be added, giving the precautions to be

observed in maintaining the unit in an approved condition.

(b) The applicant shall reproduce the design either as a separate plate or by stamping or molding it in some suitable place on each unit to which it relates. The size, type, and method of attaching and location of an approval plate are subject to the approval of the Bureau. The method of affixing the plate shall not impair the dust-collection or explosion-proof features of the unit.

(c) The approval plate identifies the unit, to which it is attached, as permissible, and is the applicant's guarantee that the unit complies with the requirements of this part. Without an approval plate, no unit has the status of "permissible" under the provisions of this part.

(d) Use of the approval plate obligates the applicant to whom the certificate of approval was granted to maintain the quality of each unit bearing it and guarantees that it is manufactured and assembled according to the drawings and specifications upon which a certificate of approval was based. Use of the approval plate is not authorized except on units that conform strictly with the drawings and specifications upon which the certificate of approval was based.

§ 33.12 Changes after certification.

If an applicant desires to change any feature of a certified unit or system, he shall first obtain the Bureau's approval of the change, pursuant to the following procedure:

(a) Application shall be made as for an original certificate, requesting that the existing certification be extended to cover the proposed changes, and shall be accompanied by drawings, specifications, and related data showing the changes in detail.

(b) The application will be examined by the Bureau to determine whether inspection and testing will be required. Testing will be necessary if there is a possibility that the modification may affect adversely the performance of the unit or system. The Bureau will inform the applicant whether such testing is required, the components or materials to be submitted for that purpose, and the fee.

(c) If the proposed modification meets the requirements of this part and Part 18 of Subchapter D of this chapter (Bureau of Mines Schedule 2, revised, the current revision of which is Schedule 2F) if applicable, a formal extension of certification will be issued, accompanied by a list of new and corrected drawings and specifications to be added to those already on file as the basis for the extension of certification.

§ 33.13 Withdrawal of certification.

The Bureau reserves the right to rescind for cause, at any time, any certification granted under this part.

Subpart B—Dust-Collector Requirements

§ 33.20 Design and construction.

(a) The Bureau will not test or investigate any dust collector that in its opinion is not constructed of suitable

materials, that evidences faulty workmanship, or that is not designed upon sound engineering principles. Since all possible designs, arrangements, or combinations of components and materials cannot be foreseen, the Bureau reserves the right to modify the tests specified in this part in such manner to obtain substantially the same information and degree of protection as provided by the tests described in Subpart C of this part.

(b) Adequacy of design and construction of a unit or system will be determined in accordance with its ability (1) to prevent the dissemination of objectionable or harmful concentrations of dust into a mine atmosphere, and (2) to protect against explosion and/or fire hazards of electrical equipment, except as provided in paragraph (b) of § 33.38.

§ 33.21 Modification of test equipment.

For test purposes the unit or system may be modified, such as by attaching instruments or measuring devices, at the Bureau's discretion; but such modification shall not alter its performance.

§ 33.22 Mode of use.

(a) A unit or system may be designed for use in connection with percussion and/or rotary drilling in any combination of the following drilling positions: (1) Vertically upward, (2) upward at angles to the vertical, (3) horizontally, and (4) downward.

(b) Dust-collector units may be designed for use with specific drilling equipment or at specific drilling speeds.

§ 33.23 Mechanical positioning of parts.

All parts of a unit that are essential to the dust-collection feature shall be provided with suitable mechanical means for positioning and maintaining such parts properly in relation to the stratum being drilled.

Subpart C—Test Requirements

§ 33.30 Test site.

Tests shall be conducted at the Bureau's Experimental Mine, Bruceton, Pennsylvania, or other appropriate place(s) determined by the Bureau.

§ 33.31 Test space.

(a) Drilling tests shall be conducted in a test space formed by two curtains suspended across a mine opening in such a manner that the volume of the test space shall be approximately 2,000 cubic feet.

(b) No mechanical ventilation shall be provided in the test space during a drilling test, except such air movement as may be induced by operation of drilling- or dust-collecting equipment.

(c) All parts of a unit or system shall be within the test space during a drilling test.

§ 33.32 Determination of dust concentration.

(a) Concentrations of airborne dust in the test space shall be determined by sampling with a midjet impinger apparatus, and a light-field microscopic technique shall be employed in determining concentrations of dust in terms of millions of particles (5 microns or less in diameter) per cubic foot of air sampled.

(b) Before a drilling test is started the surfaces of the test space shall be wetted; the test space shall be cleared of airborne dust insofar as practicable by mechanical ventilation or other means; and an atmospheric sample, designated as a control sample, shall be collected during a 5-minute period to determine residual airborne dust in the test space.

(c) A sample of airborne dust, designated as a test sample, shall be collected in the breathing zone of the drill operator during the drilling of each test hole. Time consumed in changing drill steel shall not be considered as drilling time and sampling shall be discontinued during such periods.

§ 33.33 Allowable limits of dust concentration.

(a) The concentration of dust determined by the control sample shall be subtracted from the average concentration of dust determined by the test samples, and the difference shall be designated as the net concentration of airborne dust. Calculations of the average concentration of dust determined from the test samples shall be based upon the results of not less than 80 percent of each set of 10 test samples.

(b) Under each prescribed test condition, the net concentration of airborne dust at each drill operator's position shall not exceed 10 million particles (5 microns or less in diameter) per cubic foot of air when determined in accordance with the method given in paragraph (a) of § 33.32.

§ 33.34 Drilling test.

(a) A drilling test shall consist of drilling a set of 10 holes with each drill involved under the specified operating conditions. The drilling of all sets of holes shall begin simultaneously and drilling shall continue until all holes are completed.

(b) Holes shall be drilled to a depth of 4 feet plus or minus 2 inches and shall be spaced so as not to interfere with adjacent holes. Each hole may be plugged after completion.

(c) Receptacles and filters for collecting drill cuttings shall be emptied and cleaned before each drilling test is started.

(d) Holes designated as "vertical" shall be drilled to incline not more than 10 degrees to the vertical. Holes designated as "angle" shall be drilled to incline not less than 30 and not more than 45 degrees to the vertical. Holes designated as "horizontal" shall be drilled to incline not more than 15 degrees to the horizontal.

§ 33.35 Methods of drilling; dust-collector unit.

(a) *General.* All drilling shall be done with conventional, commercial drilling equipment—pneumatic-percussion, hydraulic-rotary, and/or electric-rotary types—in accordance with the applicant's specifications.

(b) *Pneumatic-percussion drilling.* A stoper-type drill with a piston diameter of 2½ to 3 inches shall be used for roof drilling. A hand-held, sinker-type drill with a piston diameter of 2½ to 3 inches shall be used for down drilling and also for horizontal drilling, except that the

drill shall be supported mechanically. Compressed air for operating the drill shall be supplied at a gage pressure of 85–95 pounds per square inch. Drill bits shall be detachable, cross type with hard inserts, and shall be sharp when starting to drill each set of 10 holes. In roof drilling, 1¼- and 1½-inch diameter drill bits shall be used; in horizontal and down drilling, 1¾-inch diameter bits shall be used. The drill steel shall be ⅝-inch hexagonal and of hollow type to permit the introduction of compressed air through the drill steel when necessary to clean a hole during drilling.

(c) *Rotary drilling.* A hydraulic-rotary drill with a rated drilling speed of 18 feet per minute free lift, capable of rotating drill steel at 900 revolutions per minute with 100 foot-pounds torque, and having a feed force of 7,000 pounds, shall be used for roof drilling. An electric-rotary drill, supported by a post mounting, with a rated drilling speed of 30 inches per minute and powered by a 2.25 horsepower motor, shall be used for horizontal drilling. For roof drilling, the bits shall be hard-tipped, 1⅝ and 1½ inches outside diameter, and 1¼-inch auger-type drill steel shall be used. For horizontal drilling, the bits shall be hard-tipped, 2 inches outside diameter, and 1¾-inch auger-type drill steel shall be used. Drill bits shall be sharp when starting to drill each set of 10 holes.

§ 33.36 Method of drilling; combination unit or dust-collecting system.

Drilling shall be conducted in accordance with the applicant's specifications and operating instructions. If special drill bits or drill steel are required, they shall be furnished to the Bureau by the applicant. Otherwise the drill bit and drill steel requirements stated in paragraphs (b) and (c) of § 33.35 shall be complied with for all types of combination units or dust-collecting systems.

§ 33.37 Test procedure.

(a) *Roof drilling.* Drilling shall be done in friable strata, similar to the roof in the Bureau's Experimental Mine, which tends to produce large scale-like cuttings.

(b) *Horizontal drilling.* Drilling shall be done in strata comparable in hardness to that of coal-mine draw slate. Holes shall be started near the roof of the test space under conditions simulating the drilling of draw slate in coal mining.

(c) *Down drilling.* Drilling shall be done in typical mine floor strata with a pneumatic percussion-type drill. Five holes shall be drilled vertically and five holes shall be drilled at an angle.

§ 33.38 Electrical parts.

(a) Units with electrical parts and designed to operate as electric face equipment (see definition, § 45.44–1 of this chapter) in gassy coal mines shall meet the requirements of Part 18 of Subchapter D of this chapter (Bureau of Mines Schedule 2, revised, the current revision of which is Schedule 2F), and the examination and testing of the electrical parts shall be entirely separate from the examination and testing of dust-collecting equipment as such.

(b) Units with electrical parts designed to operate only outby the last open

crosscut in a coal-mine entry, room, or other opening (including electric-drive units with their controls and push buttons) are not required to comply with the provisions of Part 18 of Subchapter D of this chapter (Bureau of Mines Schedule 2, revised, the current revision of which is Schedule 2F).

[F.R. Doc. 60–2149; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration

[21 CFR Part 120]

TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FROM TOLERANCES FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICALS IN OR ON RAW AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Notice of Filing of Petitions

In re: Notice of filing of petitions for establishment of an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of 1,1,1-trichloroethane and for the establishment of a zero tolerance for residues of methylene chloride.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408(d) (1), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d) (1)), the following notice is issued:

Petitions have been filed by the Brodex Company, 1441 West Second Street, Pomona, California, proposing the establishment of an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of 1,1,1-trichloroethane and proposing the establishment of a zero tolerance for residues of methylene chloride from use of a combination of these two pesticide chemicals in the postharvest treatment of citrus fruit.

The method proposed in the petition for the determination of 1,1,1-trichloroethane and methylene chloride is based on the separation of these materials from the fruit by distillation with iso-octane, followed by vapor-phase chromatography. The distillate is injected into a column of 25 percent paraffin on acid-washed firebrick; temperature is 90° C., pressure at the inlet 5 pounds per square inch, and flow rate 60 milliliters of helium per minute.

Dated: March 1, 1960.

[SEAL] ROBERT S. ROE,
Director, Bureau of
Biological and Physical Sciences.

[F.R. Doc. 60–2151; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

[14 CFR Parts 600, 601]

[Airspace Docket No. 60–NY–2]

FEDERAL AIRWAYS, CONTROL AREAS AND REPORTING POINTS

Revocation

Pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (§ 409.13, 24 F.R. 3499), notice is hereby given

that the Federal Aviation Agency is considering an amendment to §§ 600.213, 601.213 and 601.4213 of the regulations of the Administrator, the substance of which is stated below.

Red Federal airway No. 13 presently extends in part from Providence, R.I., to the Franklin, Mass., Intersection (intersection of the north course of the Providence radio range and the southwest course of the Boston, Mass., radio range). The Federal Aviation Agency has under consideration revocation of this segment of Red 13. A Federal Aviation Agency IFR peak-day air traffic survey for the period from July 1, 1958 through June 30, 1959 shows no aircraft movements for the segment of Red 13 from Providence to Franklin. On the basis of this survey, it appears that the retention of this airway segment and its associated control areas is unjustified as an assignment of airspace and that the revocation thereof would be in the public interest. Concurrently with this action, the Franklin, Mass., Intersection (intersection of the north course of the Providence, R.I., radio range and the southwest course of the Boston, Mass., radio range) would be revoked as a designated reporting point.

If these actions are taken, the segment of Red Federal airway No. 13 and its associated control areas from Providence, R.I., to Franklin, Mass., and the Franklin, Mass., Intersection, designated reporting point would be revoked.

Interested persons may submit such written data, views or arguments as they may desire. Communications should be submitted in triplicate to the Chief, Air Traffic Management Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Federal Building, New York International Airport, Jamaica 30, N.Y. All communications received within forty-five days after publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER will be considered before action is taken on the proposed amendment. No public hearing is contemplated at this time, but arrangements for informal conferences with Federal Aviation Agency officials may be made by contacting the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief, or the Chief, Airspace Utilization Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington 25, D.C. Any data, views or arguments presented during such conferences must also be submitted in writing in accordance with this notice in order to become part of the record for consideration. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received.

The official Docket will be available for examination by interested persons at the Docket Section, Federal Aviation Agency, Room B-316, 1711 New York Avenue NW., Washington 25, D.C. An informal Docket will also be available for examination at the office of the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief.

This amendment is proposed under sections 307(a) and 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
*Director, Bureau of
Air Traffic Management.*

[F.R. Doc. 60-2146; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:46 a.m.]

[14 CFR Parts 600, 601]

[Airspace Docket No. 59-NY-55]

FEDERAL AIRWAYS, CONTROL AREAS AND REPORTING POINTS

Revocation and Modification

Pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (§ 409.13, 24 F.R. 3499), notice is hereby given that the Federal Aviation Agency is considering an amendment to §§ 600.618, 601.618, 601.4618 and 601.1470 of the regulations of the Administrator, the substance of which is stated below.

Blue Federal airway No. 18 presently extends, in part, from the intersection of the northwest course of the New York, N.Y. (La Guardia), radio range with the southwest course of the Poughkeepsie, N.Y., radio range via the Poughkeepsie radio range station, to the Albany, N.Y., radio range station. The Newburgh, N.Y., control area extension is presently described as the airspace north of Stewart AFB bounded on the north by VOR Federal airway No. 270, on the east by Blue Federal airway No. 18 and on the south and southwest by New York control area extension (§ 601.1066). The Federal Aviation Agency has under consideration revocation of the segment of Blue 18 from the intersection of the northwest course of the New York, N.Y., (La Guardia) radio range with the southwest course of the Poughkeepsie, N.Y., radio range to the Albany, N.Y., radio range station. The Federal Aviation Agency IFR peak-day survey during the period July 1, 1958, through June 30, 1959, showed less than five aircraft movements on this segment of Blue 18. On the basis of the survey, it appears that the retention of this airway segment and its associated control areas is unjustified as an assignment of airspace and that revocation thereof would be in the public interest. In addition, the caption to § 601.4618, relating to associated reporting points, would be amended to coincide with the modified airway. Concurrent with this action, the Federal Aviation Agency has under consideration a minor modification of the control area extension at Newburgh, N.Y., by redesignating the eastern boundary of this area to delete reference to Blue 18.

If these actions are taken, Blue Federal airway No. 18 between the intersection of the northwest course of the New York, N.Y. (La Guardia), radio range with the southwest course of the Poughkeepsie, N.Y., radio range to the Albany, N.Y., radio range, and its associated control areas would be revoked. The Newburgh, N.Y., control area extension would be redescribed as the airspace north of Stewart AFB bounded on

the north by VOR Federal airway No. 270; on the east by a line from its point of intersection with VOR Federal airway No. 270 at latitude 42°10'00" N., longitude 73°55'00" W., to the point of intersection with the New York, N.Y., control area extension (§ 601.1066) at latitude 41°47'10" N., longitude 73°55'00" W., and on the south and west by New York control area extension.

Interested persons may submit such written data, views or arguments as they may desire. Communications should be submitted in triplicate to the Chief, Air Traffic Management Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Federal Building, New York International Airport, Jamaica 30, N.Y. All communications received within forty-five days after publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER will be considered before action is taken on the proposed amendment. No public hearing is contemplated at this time, but arrangements for informal conferences with Federal Aviation Agency officials may be made by contacting the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief, or the Chief, Airspace Utilization Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington 25, D.C. Any data, views or arguments presented during such conferences must also be submitted in writing in accordance with this notice in order to become part of the record for consideration. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received.

The official Docket will be available for examination by interested persons at the Docket Section, Federal Aviation Agency, Room B-316, 1711 New York Avenue NW., Washington 25, D.C. An informal Docket will also be available for examination at the office of the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief.

This amendment is proposed under sections 307(a) and 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
*Director, Bureau of
Air Traffic Management.*

[F.R. Doc. 60-2147; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:46 a.m.]

[14 CFR Parts 600, 601]

[Airspace Docket No. 60-NY-6]

FEDERAL AIRWAYS, CONTROL AREAS AND REPORTING POINTS

Revocation

Pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (§ 409.13, 24 F.R. 3499), notice is hereby given that the Federal Aviation Agency is considering an amendment to §§ 600.233, 601.233 and 601.4233 of the regulations of the Administrator, the substance of which is stated below.

Red Federal airway No. 33 presently extends, in part, from the Morris, Conn.,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[47 CFR Part 3]

[Docket No. 13419; FCC 60-192]

TABLE OF ASSIGNMENTS; TELEVISION BROADCAST STATIONS

Waycross, Ga.

1. The Commission has before it the petition of the Georgia State Board of Education requesting reservation of Channel 8 as a noncommercial, educational television station at Waycross, Georgia, and further requesting that its outstanding authorization be conformed to specify construction as a noncommercial, educational station. Channel 16, as at present, would remain assigned for future commercial use. No other changes in the Table of Assignments are contemplated.

2. We note that on April 15, 1958, the Georgia State Department of Education petitioned the Commission to reserve Channel 8 at Waycross as a noncommercial, educational station. We denied this petition on October 15, 1958,¹ on the ground that the public interest would be better served by permitting all interested parties, both commercial and educational entities, to apply for the channel and have their respective proposals considered on their comparative merits.

3. Two competing applications were filed for the Channel 8 facility.² The application of the Georgia State Board of Education was granted on April 9, 1959. The applicant, petitioner herein, proposes to operate on a noncommercial, educational basis.³

4. In a related rule-making proceeding instituted by the Joint Council on Educational Television,⁴ we acknowledged that the Georgia State Board of Education is authorized to construct a station on Channel 8; and that it proposes a noncommercial, educational operation. We found, however, that circumstances would not permit us to act on the proposal of JCET that Channel 8 be reserved; but we stated that should the permittee, the Georgia State Board

¹Memorandum Opinion and Order (FCC 58-981) released October 17, 1958.

²The applications were filed by John H. Phipps, Docket No. 12714, BPCT-2423; and the Georgia State Board of Education, Docket No. 12715, BPCT-2501.

³The application of John H. Phipps was dismissed on February 5, 1959. See Order, Docket No. 12714 (FCC 59M-168), released February 6, 1959. In the Agreement attached to the Motion to Dismiss Application without Prejudice filed by Phipps on February 4, 1959 (Docket No. 12714), the State Board of Education committed itself to request the Commission to reserve Channel 8 for educational use exclusively. The Board is carrying out its commitment in the proceeding.

⁴RM-71. This proceeding was instituted by the Joint Council on Educational Television and requested reservation of VHF channels in five cities, including reservation of Channel 8 at Waycross, Georgia.

of Education, request it, we would be prepared to consider assigning the station for noncommercial, educational use exclusively.

5. Under these circumstances, we are of the view that the public interest would be served by granting the petition of the Georgia State Board of Education and considering the amendments proposed therein as follows:

City	Channel Nos.	
	Present	Proposed
Waycross, Ga.....	8+, 16	*8+, 16

6. Authority for adoption of the amendments herein is contained in sections 4(i) and 303 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

7. Any interested party who is of the opinion that the proposed amendments should not be adopted, or should not be adopted in the form set forth herein, may file with the Commission on or before April 8, 1960, a written statement or brief setting forth his comments. Comments in support of the proposed amendments may also be filed on or before the same date. Comments or briefs in reply to the original comments may be filed within 15 days from the last day for filing said original comments. No additional comments may be filed unless (1) specifically requested by the Commission, or (2) good cause for the filing of such additional comments is established.

8. In accordance with the provisions of § 1.54 of the Commission's rules, an original and 14 copies of all statements, briefs, or comments shall be furnished the Commission.

Adopted: March 2, 1960.

Released: March 4, 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 60-2176; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:49 a.m.]

[47 CFR Part 3]

[Docket No. 13421; FCC 60-194]

TABLE OF ASSIGNMENTS; TELEVISION BROADCAST STATIONS

Prescott, Ariz.

1. The Commission has before it the petition of Thunderbird Broadcasting Company (Thunderbird), licensee of standard broadcast station KNOT, Prescott, Arizona, which looks toward amendment of § 3.606, Table of Assignments, Television Broadcast Stations, in the following respects:

City	Channel No.	
	Present	Proposed
Prescott, Ariz.....	15	7, 15

intersection (intersection of the east course of the Poughkeepsie, N.Y., radio range and the southwest course of the Chicopee Falls, Westover AFB, Mass., radio range) to the Chicopee Falls, Mass., radio range. The Federal Aviation Agency has under consideration revocation of this segment of Red 33. The Federal Aviation Agency IFR peak-day airway traffic survey for the period July 1, 1958, through June 30, 1959, showed no aircraft movements for the segment of Red 33 from Morris intersection to Chicopee Falls. On the basis of this survey, it appears that retention of this airway segment and its associated control areas is unjustified as an assignment of airspace and that the revocation thereof would be in the public interest.

If this action is taken, the segment of Red Federal airway No. 33 and its associated control areas from Morris, Conn., intersection to Chicopee Falls, Mass., would be revoked. In addition, the caption to § 601.4233 relating to designated reporting points would be amended to conform to the modified airway.

Interested persons may submit such written data, views or arguments as they may desire. Communications should be submitted in triplicate to the Chief, Air Traffic Management Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Federal Building, New York International Airport, Jamaica 30, N.Y. All communications received within forty-five days after publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER will be considered before action is taken on the proposed amendment. No public hearing is contemplated at this time, but arrangements for informal conferences with Federal Aviation Agency officials may be made by contacting the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief, or the Chief, Airspace Utilization Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington 25, D.C. Any data, views or arguments presented during such conferences must also be submitted in writing in accordance with this notice in order to become part of the record for consideration. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received.

The official Docket will be available for examination by interested persons at the Docket Section, Federal Aviation Agency, Room B-316, 1711 New York Avenue NW., Washington 25, D.C. An informal Docket will also be available for examination at the office of the Regional Air Traffic Management Division Chief.

This amendment is proposed under sections 307(a) and 313(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 749, 752; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1960.

D. D. THOMAS,
Director, Bureau of
Air Traffic Management.

[F. R. Doc. 60-2148; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:46 a.m.]

PROPOSED RULE MAKING

2. In support of its proposal, petitioner shows that there is little probability that the existing Channel 15 assignment will be implemented, due to competition from a community antenna system which provides a four-channel service from the Phoenix market to a large number of VHF television receivers in the area; that the proposal to assign Channel 7 to Prescott meets our minimum spacing requirements, the nearest co-channel and adjacent channel stations and assignments being well over 190 and 60 miles, respectively, from Prescott; and that there is a need for the service at Prescott. Further, Thunderbird gives assurance that it would apply for a construction permit for the facility in the event the channel is assigned to Prescott.

3. Under these circumstances, we are of the view that the public interest would be served by granting the petition of Thunderbird and considering the amendment proposed therein.

4. Authority for adoption of the amendments herein is contained in sections 4(i), 303, and 307(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

5. Any interested party who is of the opinion that the proposed amendments should not be adopted, or should not be adopted in the form set forth herein, may file with the Commission on or before April 8, 1960, a written statement or brief setting forth his comments. Comments in support of the proposed amendments may also be filed on or be-

fore the same date. Comments or briefs in reply to the original comments may be filed within 15 days from the last day for filing said original comments.

6. In accordance with the provisions of § 1.54 of the Commission's rules, an original and 14 copies of all statements, briefs, or comments shall be furnished the Commission.

Adopted: March 2, 1960.

Released: March 4, 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,

[SEAL]

MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2177; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:49 a.m.]

Notices

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[Docket 7382; Order E-14973]

FORT WORTH INVESTIGATION

Order To Show Cause

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C., on the 1st day of March 1960.

Pursuant to the terms of the Board's order in the original proceeding herein,¹ the City and Chamber of Commerce of Fort Worth, Texas, filed a motion to reopen this case. Its principal complaints are that American has downgraded its Fort Worth-Washington/New York service since the Board's decision, and that Braniff had consistently failed to provide service between these communities.²

American Airlines, Inc., Braniff Airways, Inc., Continental Airlines, Inc., and the City and Chamber of Commerce of Dallas, Texas, filed answers opposing Fort Worth's motion on the grounds, *inter alia*, that the matters alleged were repetitious and had been fully considered and disposed of in the Board's decision. Bureau Counsel, on the other hand, urged the Board to reopen this proceeding for further consideration of the adequacy of Fort Worth's service to Washington and New York. Replies to Bureau Counsel's answer were permitted by the Board³ and were filed by all the foregoing parties except Continental.

After careful consideration of the pleadings now before us in light of the Board's 1958 decision and the requirements of section 404(a) of the Act, it appears that the service offered in the Fort Worth-New York/Washington market is no longer adequate within the meaning of that section, and that appropriate action should be taken to remedy this situation.⁴

In its prior decision, the Board found American's service in the Fort Worth-

New York/Washington markets adequate at the time of decision, although it may have been inadequate in certain respects in the Fort Worth-New York market prior thereto. Since then the effective service—limited stop single plane service—provided by American has decreased significantly. The carrier has made no showing which reasonably justifies the diminished service.⁵ In view of the record and circumstances of this case, we can no longer consider the service offered by American in the Fort Worth-New York/Washington markets as adequate.

Turning now to Braniff, the other carrier authorized to serve these markets, we note that its service has not changed in any respect since the issuance of the Board's order—Braniff offered no single-plane service in either of these markets in May 1958, and does not offer such service currently. At the time of its decision, the Board found that, while Braniff's service would be plainly inadequate if it were the only carrier serving these markets, the meager response of Fort Worth travelers during the period that the carrier had provided single-plane service demonstrated that Braniff's service, considering the additional services operated by American, was adequate to meet the needs of the public. In view of the present inadequacy of American's service, it is apparent that Braniff's service no longer meets the standard required by section 404(a) of the Act.

After exploring the record in this proceeding and the pleadings filed thereafter, we believe that as much, or more, effective service in the Fort Worth-New York/Washington markets should be provided as at the time the Board determined the service was adequate (see Appendix B to Order E-12996). Whether such service should be provided wholly by American, or partially by American and partially by Braniff, remains to be decided. We shall make such determination after giving the parties an opportunity to make their views known. In order to facilitate prompt disposition of this matter, including early implementation of our decision, each party will be expected to file a detailed statement of proposed findings and conclusions together with the terms of a proposed order.⁶

Accordingly, it is ordered, That:

1. This proceeding be and it hereby is reopened for reargument and reconsideration as provided hereinafter.

⁵ Traffic in domestic operations has grown substantially since the record was closed, but the available data indicate that in the Fort Worth-New York market it has increased only moderately, and in the Fort Worth-Washington market it has actually decreased. No reasonable explanation for such results appears other than that the service provided Fort Worth is not meeting the reasonable needs of that city, and therefore has retarded traffic development.

⁶ Cf. Nonpriority Mail Rates, Order E-14882, January 29, 1960.

2. American be and it hereby is directed to show cause why the Board should not issue an order, pursuant to section 404(a) of the Act, requiring American to provide as much, or more, single plane limited stop service between Fort Worth, on the one hand, and Washington and New York, on the other hand, as were in existence and reflected in respective schedules appearing in Appendix B of Order E-12996.

3. Braniff be and it hereby is directed to show cause why the Board should not issue an order, pursuant to section 404(a) of the Act, requiring Braniff to provide a portion of the volume of service as set forth in ordering paragraph "2" above.

4. Copies of this order shall be served upon American, Braniff, Dallas, Fort Worth, and Bureau Counsel, and each such party shall, within twenty days from the date of service of this order, file a detailed statement of proposed findings and conclusions together with the terms of a proposed order. Thereafter oral argument shall be heard by the Board on March 30, 1960, at 10:00 a.m. in Room 1027, Universal Building, Connecticut and Florida Avenues NW., Washington, D.C.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board.

[SEAL]

MABEL MCCART,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2162; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:48 a.m.]

[Docket No. 11197; Order No. E-14979]

PACIFIC AIR LINES, INC.

Excursion Fare; Order of Investigation

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C. on the 3d day of March 1960.

On February 1, 1960, Pacific Air Lines, Inc. (Pacific) filed a tariff¹ to become effective on March 7, 1960, providing for a round-trip excursion fare of \$25.00 between Burbank, California and Las Vegas, Nevada. The current coach fare per mile is 6.55 cents and the proposed excursion fare per mile is 5.36 cents. Among other expressed conditions attached to the use of the proposed fare are that the return trip must be made within two days after the date of departure of the going portion; stopovers at intermediate points will not be permitted; and no reductions will be made for children.

Trans World Airlines, Inc. (Docket 11157) and United Air Lines, Inc. (Docket 11156) filed complaints alleging, *inter alia*, that the proposed excursion fare is unreasonably low and will increase Pacific's need for subsidy; that Pacific would merely dilute its own traffic under the proposed fare and thus suffer dilution of its revenues; that Burbank-Las

¹ Pacific Air Lines, Inc. C.A.B. 3.

¹ Order E-12996, September 23, 1958; Fort Worth's petition for modification denied, Order E-13309, December 22, 1958. In Order E-12996 the Board stated that "it is in the public interest for the Board to retain jurisdiction of the present proceeding * * * in the event reasonable grounds should hereafter occur for believing that the air carriers serving Fort Worth may no longer be providing adequate service, [in order that] further action may be taken herein."

² Fort Worth also complained of the service provided by Continental and by Trans-Texas as a result of Board action in other proceedings. However, neither of these matters appears relevant to the issues of the Fort Worth case. Further, Fort Worth's appendix to its reply to Bureau Counsel's answer shows schedules of service between Fort Worth, on the one hand, and Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, and Lubbock, on the other hand.

³ Order E-14587, October 27, 1959.

⁴ Fort Worth's reply to Bureau Counsel's answer does not provide us with sufficient reason to take any action as to Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, and Lubbock.

Vegas is essentially a trunkline market outside the scope of the traffic objectives Pacific was certificated to serve; and that the proposed fare, if it did produce new traffic, would tend to do so at present peak weekend periods, further increasing the imbalance in traffic as between days of the week.

The foregoing questions raised by the complaints warrant an investigation of the proposed excursion fare. These questions are similar to those under investigation in the Matter of Excursion Fares Proposed by Pacific Air Lines, Inc., Docket 10976, instituted by Order E-14614 of November 5, 1959, and should be consolidated with the investigation ordered herein. However, the allegations of unlawfulness of the proposed fare and the potential impact upon the competitors of Pacific do not, in our opinion, warrant suspension pending investigation.

The Board finds that its action herein is necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions and objectives of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, particularly sections 204(a), 403, 404, and 1002 thereof.

Accordingly, it is ordered, That:

1. An investigation is instituted to determine whether the excursion fare and provisions between Burbank, California and Las Vegas, Nevada, appearing in Pacific Air Lines, Inc.'s tariff C.A.B. 3, including subsequent revisions or modifications thereof, are or will be unjust, unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory, unduly preferential, unduly prejudicial, or otherwise unlawful, and if found to be unlawful, to determine and prescribe the lawful fare and provisions.

2. The proceeding ordered herein be consolidated into the proceeding ordered in Docket 10976.

3. The proceeding ordered herein be assigned for hearing before an examiner of the Board at a time and place hereafter to be designated.

4. The complaints of Trans World Airlines, Inc. in Docket 11157 and of United Air Lines, Inc., in Docket 11156, to the extent each requests investigation of the proposed fare and provisions, are consolidated herein. In all other particulars such complaints are dismissed.

5. Copies of this order be served upon Pacific Air Lines, Inc., Trans World Airlines, Inc., and United Air Lines, Inc., which are hereby made parties to this proceeding. This order shall also be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board.

[SEAL] MABEL McCART,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2163; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:48 a.m.]

[Docket 10064]

WEST COAST AIRLINES, INC.

Notice of Prehearing Conference

In the matter of the renewal of West Coast Airlines' temporary intermediate points.

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Aviation

Act of 1958, that a prehearing conference in the above-entitled proceeding is assigned to be held on March 31, 1960, at 10:00 a.m., e.s.t., in Room 725, Universal Building, Connecticut and Florida Avenues NW., Washington, D.C., before Examiner Thomas L. Wrenn.

Dated at Washington, D.C., March 2, 1960.

[SEAL] FRANCIS W. BROWN,
Chief Examiner.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2164; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:48 a.m.]

[Docket 11126]

AEROVIAS ECUATORIANAS, C.A.

Notice of Hearing

In the matter of Aerovias Ecuatorianas, C.A., permit cancellation case.

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, that hearing in the above-entitled proceeding is assigned to be held on March 22, 1960, at 10:00 a.m., e.s.t., in Room 701, Universal Building, Connecticut and Florida Avenues NW., Washington, D.C., before Examiner Curtis C. Henderson.

Dated at Washington, D.C., March 2, 1960.

[SEAL] FRANCIS W. BROWN,
Chief Examiner.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2165; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:48 a.m.]

[Docket 10930]

MODERN AIR TRANSPORT, INC., AND JOHN P. BECKER ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDING

Notice of Oral Argument

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, that oral argument in the above-entitled proceeding is assigned to be held on March 23, 1960, at 10:00 a.m., e.s.t., in Room 1027, Universal Building, Connecticut and Florida Avenues NW., Washington, D.C., before the Board.

Dated at Washington, D.C., March 2, 1960.

[SEAL] FRANCIS W. BROWN,
Chief Examiner.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2166; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:48 a.m.]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Docket No. 13385; FCC 60M-420]

ANTENNAVISION SERVICE CO., INC.

Order Continuing Hearing

In re applications of Antennavision Service Company, Inc., Phoenix, Arizona, Docket No. 13385; for construction permit for new fixed radio station at Oatman Mountain, Arizona, File No. 2984-C1-P-59 (KPK30); for construction per-

mit for new fixed radio station at Telegraph Pass, Arizona, File No. 2985-C1-P-59 (KPK31).

The Hearing Examiner having under consideration a change in the date for commencement of hearing;

It appearing that a prehearing conference was held on March 2, 1960, at which time the posture of the case was discussed and all parties have agreed that the hearing should not be commenced prior to the middle of May;

It is ordered, This 2d day of March 1960, that the hearing now scheduled to commence on March 21 is continued to May 16, 1960.

Released: March 4, 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,

[SEAL] MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2168; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:48 a.m.]

[Docket No. 13410; FCC 60M-431]

IDAHO MICROWAVE, INC.

Order Continuing Hearing Conference

In re applications of Idaho Microwave, Inc., Docket No. 13410; for construction permit for new fixed radio station at Kimport Peak, Idaho (KPL24), File No. 2672-C1-P-58; for construction permit for new fixed radio station at Rock Creek, Idaho (KPL25), File No. 2673-C1-P-58; for construction permit for new fixed radio station at Jerome, Idaho (KPL26), File No. 2674-C1-P-58.

It is ordered, This 4th day of March 1960, that the prehearing conference in the above-entitled matter presently scheduled for March 18, 1960, is hereby continued to a date to be later specified.

Released: March 4, 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,

[SEAL] MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2169; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:48 a.m.]

[Docket No. 13326; FCC 60M-418]

KDEF BROADCASTING CO. (KDEF)

Notice of Conference

In re application of KDEF Broadcasting Co. (KDEF), Albuquerque, New Mexico, Docket No. 13326, File No. BP-12293; for construction permit.

Notice is hereby given that a prehearing conference in the above-entitled proceeding will be held at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, March 9, 1960, in Room 206, Federation Building, 9th Street and Mt. Vernon Place NW., Washington, D.C.

Dated: March 2, 1960.

Released: March 4, 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,

[SEAL] MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2170; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:48 a.m.]

[Docket No. 12373; FCC 60M-425]

MORROW RADIO MANUFACTURING CO. AND RAY E. MORROW**Order Scheduling Prehearing Conference**

In the matter of Morrow Radio Manufacturing Co., Salem, Oregon, and Ray E. Morrow, Salem, Oregon, Docket No. 13373; order to show cause why there should not be revoked the licenses for Citizens Radio Stations 13W0470 and 13W0089 and why a cease and desist order should not be issued.

On the Hearing Examiner's own motion: *It is ordered*, This 3d day of March, 1960, pursuant to the provisions of § 1.111 of the Commission's rules that the parties or their counsel in the above-entitled proceeding are directed to appear for a prehearing conference at the offices of the Commission, Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m. on March 11, 1960.

In order to conserve time counsel are requested to confer a day or two beforehand with a view to reaching advance agreement upon such routine details as the manner of presentation, dates for exchange of exhibits and such other dates as may be deemed necessary. In view of the design of the prehearing conference procedure to encourage the formulation of agreements by the parties looking towards the elimination of unessentials, so that hearing may proceed with proper dispatch, it is requested that the parties or their counsel attend this conference prepared fully to discuss—and to agree upon—such matters as will conduce materially to the attainment of this objective.

Released: March 4, 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,

[SEAL] MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2172; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:48 a.m.]

[Docket No. 13418; FCC 60M-422]

ALVIN W. STEVENSON**Order Scheduling Hearing**

In the matter of Alvin W. Stevenson, 6532 Catalpa Drive, Cincinnati 39, Ohio, Docket No. 13418, order to show cause why there should not be revoked the License for Citizens Radio Station 19W2347.

It is ordered, This 2d day of March 1960, that David I. Kraushaar will preside at the hearing in the above-entitled proceeding which is hereby scheduled to commence on April 29, 1960, in Washington, D. C.

Released: March 4, 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,

[SEAL] MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2173; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:49 a.m.]

[Docket No. 13414; FCC 60M-426]

WDUL TELEVISION CORP. (WHYZ-TV)**Notice of Prehearing Conference**

In re application of WDUL Television Corp. (WHYZ-TV), Duluth, Minnesota, Docket No. 13414. File No. BMPCT-5375; for modification of construction permit.

There will be a prehearing conference, under Rule 1.111, on Monday, March 21, 1960, at 9 a.m., in the offices of the Commission, Washington, D.C.

Dated: March 3, 1960.

Released: March 4, 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,

[SEAL] MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2174; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:49 a.m.]

[Docket No. 6517; FCC 60M-429]

WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH CO. AND POSTAL TELEGRAPH, INC.**Order Scheduling Prehearing Conference**

In the matter of the application for merger of the Western Union Telegraph Company and Postal Telegraph, Inc., Docket No. 6517.

It is ordered, This 3d day of March 1960, that a prehearing conference, pursuant to § 1.111 of the Commission's rules, will be held in this matter commencing at 10:00 a.m., March 15, 1960, in the Commission's offices in Washington, D.C.

Released: March 4, 1960.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,

[SEAL] MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2175; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:49 a.m.]

[Mexican List 219]

MEXICAN BROADCAST STATIONS**Changes, Proposed Changes, and Corrections**

FEBRUARY 10, 1960.

Notification under the provisions of Part III, section 2 of the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement. List of changes, proposed changes and correction in assignments of Mexican Broadcast Stations modifying the appendix containing assignments of Mexican Broadcast Stations (Mimeograph 47214-6) attached to the recommendations of the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement Engineering Meeting January 30, 1941.

Call letters	Location	Power kw	Antenna	Schedule	Class	Expected date of commencement of operation
		560 kilocycles				
XEHA (change in call letters from XECC).	Tecate, Baja California...	0.25 kw.....	ND	U	IV	Feb. 10, 1960
		690 kilocycles				
XERG (change in call letters from XEEO).	Monterrey, Nuevo Leon...	0.25 kw D/0.2 kw N.	ND	U	II	Do.
		770 kilocycles				
XEMV (PO: 1530 kc)....	Los Mochis, Sinaloa.....	2.5 kw.....	ND	D	II	Aug. 10, 1960
		820 kilocycles				
XEEU (delete assignment — upon commencement of operation at Tuxpan, Nayarit).	Tepic, Nayarit.....	1 kw.....	ND	D	II	
XEUX (PO: 1340 kc 1 kw D/0.25 kw N IV).	Tuxpan, Nayarit.....	5 kw.....	ND	D	II	Aug. 10, 1960
XESB (change in call letters and increase in power. PO: XEES 0.5 kw).	Sta. Barbara, Chihuahua.	1 kw.....	ND	D	II	Feb. 10, 1960
		850 kilocycles				
XEAL (PO: 1490 kc 0.5 kw D/0.25 kw N).	Manzanillo, Colima.....	1 kw.....	ND	D	II	Aug. 10, 1960
		920 kilocycles				
XEXK (change in call letters from XEEY).	Ensenada, Baja California.	0.5 kw.....	ND	D	III	Feb. 10, 1960
XEU (now in operation on new frequency).	Veracruz, Veracruz.....	5 kw D/0.5 kw N..	ND	U	III	Jan. 21, 1960
XEPK (change in call letters from XEHM).	Chihuahua, Chihuahua.	0.25 kw.....	ND	U	IV	Feb. 10, 1960
		960 kilocycles				
XECO (change in call letters from XEHA).	Ciudad, Chihuahua.....	0.25 kw D/0.1 kw N.	ND	U	IV	Do.
XEGB (PO: 840 kc 0.25 kw ND D II).	Coatzacoalcos, Veracruz..	1 kw D/0.5 kw N..	ND	U	III	Aug. 10, 1960
New (delete assignment—upon commencement of operation at Coatzacoalcos, Veracruz).	Veracruz, Veracruz.....	1 kw D/0.5 kw N..	ND	U	III	

Call letters	Location	Power kw	Antenna	Schedule	Class	Expected date of commencement of operation
XEOT (new assignment).	San Pedro de las Colonias Coahuila.	980 kilocycles 0.5 kw-----	ND	U	III	Aug. 10, 1960
XEWL (change in call letters from XERG).	Nuevo Laredo, Tamaulipas.	1090 kilocycles 2.5 kw-----	ND	D	II	Feb. 10, 1960
XEAC (change in call letters and increase in power. P.O. XEY 0.5 kw).	Aguascalientes, Aguascalientes.	1170 kilocycles 1 kw-----	ND	D	II	Do.
XEUU (change in call letters from XEUT).	Colima, Colima.	1280 kilocycles 0.25 kw-----	ND	U	IV	Do.
XEYE (change in call letters from XEEY).	La Paz, Baja California.	1310 kilocycles 0.5 kw-----	ND	U	III-B	Jan. 10, 1960
CECW (PO: 1600 kc). XEOE (new assignment).	Los Mochis, Sinaloa. Tapachula, Chiapas.	1340 kilocycles 1 kw D/0.2 kw N. 0.5 kw D/0.25 kw N.	ND ND	U U	IV IV	Aug. 10, 1960 Do.
XECO (change in call letters from XEMX).	Mexico, D.F.	1380 kilocycles 5 kw-----	ND	U	III-A	Feb. 10, 1960
XEEX (new assignment).	El Dorado, Sinaloa.	1400 kilocycles 0.25 kw D/0.15 kw N.	ND	U	IV	Aug. 10, 1960
XEES (change in call letters from XESB).	Sta. Barbara, Chihuahua.	1 kw D/0.2 kw N.	ND	U	IV	Feb. 10, 1960
XEZC (new assignment).	Ciudad Camargo, Tamaulipas.	0.25 kw D/0.1 kw N. 1420 kilocycles	ND	U	IV	Aug. 10, 1960
XEHM (change in call letters and decrease in day power. (PO: 1 kw D/0.15 kw N).	Pachuca, Hidalgo.	0.25 kw D/0.15 kw N. 1460 kilocycles	ND	U	IV	May 10, 1960
XEDY (new assignment).	Cuervos, Baja California.	1 kw D/0.2 kw N.	ND	U	III	Aug. 10, 1960
XEGN (delete assignment—upon commencement of operation at Etla, Oaxaca).	Oaxaca, Oaxaca.	0.5 kw D/0.25 kw N.	ND	U	IV	
XEET (increase night power from 0.15 kw).	Etla, Oaxaca.	1 kw D/0.25 kw N. 1490 kilocycles	ND	U	IV	Aug. 10, 1960
XEJR (PO: 0.1 kw U).	Hidalgo del Parral, Chihuahua.	1 kw D/0.2 kw N.	ND	U	IV	Feb. 10, 1960

[SEAL]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
MARY JANE MORRIS,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2171; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960; 8:48 a.m.]

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[Notice 275]

MOTOR CARRIER TRANSFER PROCEEDINGS

MARCH 4, 1960.

Synopses of orders entered pursuant to section 212(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and rules and regulations prescribed thereunder (49 CFR Part 179), appear below:

As provided in the Commission's special rules of practice any interested person may file a petition seeking reconsideration of the following numbered proceedings within 20 days from the date of publication of this notice. Pursuant to section 17(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, the filing of such a petition will postpone the effective date of the order in that proceeding pending its dis-

position. The matters relied upon by petitioners must be specified in their petitions with particularity.

No. MC-FC 62972. By order of February 29, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Gay Hudson Moving and Storage Company, a corporation, St. Louis, Missouri, of a portion of a Certificate in No. MC 22692, issued April 1, 1942, to J. E. Dunlap, doing business as Dunlap Transfer, Cairo, Illinois, authorizing the transportation of household goods, as defined by the Commission, between Cairo, Ill., and points within 25 miles of Cairo, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Missouri. George M. Elliott, 316 Rio Grande Natl. Life Building, Dallas, Texas.

No. MC-FC 62927. By order of February 29, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Morgan Pipe Haulers, Inc., Greensboro, North Carolina, of a portion of Certificate in No.

MC 70022, issued July 29, 1948, to Morgan Trucking Co., Inc., Greensboro, North Carolina, authorizing the transportation of cast iron pipe and cast iron pipe fittings, over irregular routes, from Radford, Va., to points in North Carolina and South Carolina. Charles Ephraim, 1001 15th Street, NW., Washington 5, D.C., for applicants.

No. MC-FC 62921. By order of February 29, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to William F. Cartwright, dba South Prospect Transfer, Kansas City, Missouri, of a portion of a Certificate in No. MC 105960, issued July 3, 1946, to Mrs. H. T. Swink, dba Swink Bonded Transfer, Jacksonville, Texas, authorizing the transportation of household goods, as defined by the Commission, between points in Cherokee County, Tex., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Louisiana and Mississippi. Tom B. Kretsinger, Kretsinger & Kretsinger, Suite 1014-18 Temple Building, Kansas City 6, Missouri, for applicants.

No. MC-FC 62918. By order of March 1, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Russell E. Alltop, doing business as Russell E. Alltop Transfer, Martins Ferry, Ohio; of Certificate in No. MC 42998, issued May 21, 1941, to J. E. Martin, Martins Ferry, Ohio; authorizing the transportation of: Household goods, between points in Belmont, Harrison, and Jefferson Counties, Ohio, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. James M. Burch, Jr., 44 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, for applicants.

No. MC-FC 62896. By order of February 29, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to A. B. C. Inc., 120 Plympton Street, North Providence, Rhode Island, of a Certificate in No. MC 113583, issued June 30, 1952, to The Short Line of Massachusetts, Inc., 63 East Main Street, Webster, Massachusetts, authorizing the transportation of: Passengers and their baggage, and express and newspapers in the same vehicles with passengers, over a regular route, between Worcester, Mass., and Putnam, Conn., serving intermediate points.

No. MC-FC 62993. By order of February 29, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Ward Bros. Transfer & Storage Co., Inc., Janesville, Wisconsin, of a Certificate in No. MC 109955 Sub 2, issued January 14, 1955, to Carl W. Luedtke and Carl W. Luedtke, Jr., a partnership, doing business as Ward Bros. Transfer & Storage Co., Janesville, Wisconsin, authorizing the transportation of specific commodities, from, to, and between, specified points in Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, and Michigan. Edward Solie, Solie and Solie, 715 First National Bank Building, Madison 3, Wisconsin, for applicants.

No. MC-FC 63001. By order of February 29, 1960, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to Edward McConach, Brooklyn, New York, of a Certificate in No. MC 907941 issued November 27, 1959, to Albert DeVito, doing business as DeVito Motors, Brooklyn, New York, authorizing the transportation of specific commodities from, to, and between points

in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Morris Honig, 150 Broadway, New York 38, New York, for applicants.

[SEAL]

HAROLD D. McCoy,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2157; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:47 a.m.]

[Notice 116]

MOTOR CARRIER ALTERNATE ROUTE DEVIATION NOTICES

MARCH 4, 1960.

The following letter-notices of proposals to operate over deviation routes for operating convenience only with service at no intermediate points have been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, under the Commission's Deviation Rules Revised, 1957 (49 CFR 211.1(c) (8)), and notice thereof to all interested persons is hereby given as provided in such rules (49 CFR 211.1(d) (4)).

Protests against the use of any proposed deviation route herein described may be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission in the manner and form provided in such rules (49 CFR 211.1(e)) at any time but will not operate to stay commencement of the proposed operations unless filed within 30 days from the date of publication.

Successively filed letter-notices of the same carrier under the Commission's Deviation Rules Revised, 1957, will be numbered consecutively for convenience in identification and protests if any should refer to such letter-notices by number.

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PROPERTY

No. MC 18121 (Deviation No. 2) ADVANCE TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, 2115 South First Street, Milwaukee 7, Wisconsin, filed February 24, 1960. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, of *general commodities*, with certain exceptions, over a deviation route as follows: From Racine, Wis., over Wisconsin Highway 11 to junction U.S. Highway 41, and return over the same route, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport the same commodities over the following service routes: From Racine over Wisconsin Highway 20 to junction U.S. Highway 41, and return over the same route.

No. MC 28263 (Deviation No. 1) McMACKEN TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, 933 North 24th Street, Omaha 2, Nebraska, filed February 23, 1960. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, of *general commodities*, with certain exceptions, over a deviation route as follows: From Plattsmouth, Nebr., over U.S. Highway 75 to South Topeka, Kans., Interchange, and thence over the Kansas Turnpike to the East Wichita, Kans., Interchange, thence over U.S. Highway 54 to Wichita and return over the same route, for operating convenience only, serving no

intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport the same commodities over a pertinent service route as follows: From Plattsmouth north over U.S. Highway 75 to Omaha, Nebr., thence over U.S. Highway 6 via Lincoln, Nebr., to Fairmont, Nebr., thence south over U.S. Highway 81 via Belleville, McPherson, and Newton, Kans., to Wichita, and return over the same route.

No. MC 37490 (Deviation No. 1), DUNCAN TRUCK LINES, Flandreau, S. Dak., filed February 17, 1960. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier* by motor vehicle of *general commodities*, with certain exceptions, over deviation routes, as follows: (A) From Gaylord, Minn., over Minnesota Highway 19 to Junction U.S. Highway 169, thence over U.S. Highway 169 to Shakopee, Minn., thence over Minnesota Highway 101 to Junction Minnesota Highway 13, thence over Minnesota Highway 13 to Junction Minnesota Highway 55 (near Mendota, Minn.), thence over Minnesota Highway 55 to Junction Minnesota Highway 5, thence over Minnesota Highway 5 to St. Paul, Minnesota; (B) from Gaylord to Shakopee, Minn., as described above, thence over Minnesota Highway 101 to Junction U.S. Highway 65, thence over U.S. Highway 65 to Minneapolis, Minnesota; and (C) from the Junction of U.S. Highway 212 and Minnesota Highway 5 over U.S. Highway 212 to St. Paul, and return over the same routes, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate routes. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to operate over the following service routes: From Gaylord over Minnesota Highway 22 to Glencoe, Minn., thence over U.S. Highway 212 to St. Paul; and return over the same route.

No. MC 109834 (Sub No. 3) (Deviation No. 2) NOVICK TRANSFER CO., INC., 700 North Cameron Street, Winchester, Va., filed February 24, 1960. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle of *general commodities*, with certain exceptions over deviation routes as follows: (a) From the junction of U.S. Highways 29 and 50 near Washington, over U.S. Highway 29 to Charlottesville, Va., thence over U.S. Highway 250 to Waynesboro, Va.; and (b) from junction U.S. Highways 29 and 50 near Washington over U.S. Highway 29 to junction Virginia Highway 6, and return over the same routes, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport the same commodities over pertinent service routes as follows: From Baltimore, Md., over U.S. Highway 40 to Frederick, Md., thence over U.S. Highway 340 to Berryville, Va., thence over Alternate U.S. Highway 340 to Winchester, Va., thence over U.S. Highway 11 to Staunton, Va., thence over U.S. Highway 250 to Waynesboro, Va., thence over Virginia Highway 151 to junction Virginia Highway 6, and thence over Virginia Highway 6 to junction U.S. Highway 29; from Baltimore over U.S. Highway 1 to junction U.S.

Highways 29 and 50, and return over the same routes.

By the Commission.

[SEAL]

HAROLD D. McCoy,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2156; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:47 a.m.]

[Notice 313]

MOTOR CARRIER APPLICATIONS AND CERTAIN OTHER PROCEEDINGS

MARCH 4, 1960.

The following publications are governed by the Interstate Commerce Commission's general rules of practice (49 CFR 1.40) including Special Rules (49 CFR 1.241) governing notice of filing of applications by motor carriers of property or passengers or brokers under sections 206, 209 and 211 of the Interstate Commerce Act and certain other proceedings with respect thereto.

All hearings will be called at 9:30 o'clock a.m., United States standard time (or 9:30 o'clock a.m., local daylight saving time) unless otherwise specified.

APPLICATIONS ASSIGNED FOR ORAL HEARING OR PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PROPERTY

No. MC 623 (Sub No. 27), filed January 25, 1960. Applicant: H. MESSICK, INC., P.O. Box 214, Duquesne and Newman Roads, Joplin, Mo. Applicant's attorney: Turner White, 809 Woodruff Building, Springfield, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Dangerous explosives, blasting agents, supplies and materials*, from points in Jasper County, Mo., to Milltown and Marengo, Ind., and points within six miles of each destination point.

HEARING: May 6, 1960, at the Missouri Public Service Commission, Jefferson City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 160.

No. MC 6264 (Sub No. 4), filed October 2, 1959. Applicant: LEWIS W. GROOM, doing business as L & N TRANSFER, Route No. 1, Cassville, Wis. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over a regular route, transporting: *General Commodities*, including *household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment*, but excluding articles of unusual value and Class A and B explosives, between Dubuque, Iowa, and Bagley, Wis., from Dubuque over U.S. Highway 61 to junction Wisconsin Highway 133, thence over Wisconsin Highway 133 to junction Grant County Highway N, thence over Grant County Highway N to junction Grant County Highway U, thence over Grant County Highway U to junction Grant County Highway V, thence over Grant County Highway V to junction Grant County Highway W, thence over Grant County Highway W to junction Grant County Highway A, thence over Grant County Highway A to Bagley, and

return over the same route, serving the intermediate points of Burton and Beeton, Wis. Applicant is authorized to conduct operations in Iowa and Wisconsin.

NOTE: Any duplication with present authority to be eliminated.

HEARING: May 16, 1960, at the Federal Office Building, Fifth and Court Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa, before Joint Board No. 202.

No. MC 7746 (Sub No. 96), filed November 27, 1959. Applicant: UNITED TRUCK LINES, INC., East 915 Springfield Avenue, Spokane 2, Wash. Applicant's attorney: George R. LaBissoniere, 654 Central Building, Seattle 4, Wash. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, transporting: *General commodities*, except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, and commodities in bulk, serving the Azwell Dam, located approximately fifty (50) miles north of Wenatchee, Wash., on the Columbia River, and construction installations within fifteen (15) miles of the Azwell Dam, as intermediate and off-route points in connection with applicant's authorized regular route operations. Applicant is authorized to conduct operations in Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington.

HEARING: May 6, 1960, at the Federal Office Bldg., First and Marion Streets, Seattle, Wash., before Joint Board No. 80, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner William R. Tyers.

No. MC 7746 (Sub No. 99), filed January 20, 1960. Applicant: UNITED TRUCK LINES, INC., East 915 Springfield Avenue, Spokane 2, Wash. Applicant's attorney: George R. LaBissoniere, 654 Central Building, Seattle 4, Wash. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *General commodities*, except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk and those requiring special equipment, between Junction U.S. Highway 95 and U.S. Highway 30, near Fruitland, Idaho, and Pasco, Wash.; from Junction U.S. Highway 95 and 30 over U.S. Highway 30 to Junction U.S. Highway 395, and thence over U.S. Highway 395 to Pasco, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points and serving junction U.S. Highways 95 and 30 for purposes of joinder only, as an alternate route for operating convenience only in connection with applicant's authorized regular route operations between Boise, Idaho, and Seattle, Wash.

NOTE: Applicant indicates the following restrictions in connection with the proposed operations: (1) restricted to the transportation of shipments (a) interchanged by carrier at Seattle, Wash., or (b) originating at or destined to points in Washington on, north or west of a line beginning at Hoquiam, Wash., and extending along U.S. Highway 410 at Yakima, Wash., and thence along an imaginary north-south line extending between Yakima, Wash., and the United States-Canada boundary line.

HEARING: May 3, 1960, at the Federal Office Building, First and Marion Streets, Seattle, Washington, before Joint Board No. 81, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner William R. Tyers.

No. MC 10761 (Sub No. 92), filed February 15, 1960. Applicant: TRANS-AMERICAN FREIGHT LINES, INC., 1700 North Waterman Avenue, Detroit 9, Mich. Applicant's attorney: Howell Ellis, 520 Illinois Building, Indianapolis, Ind. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities*, except those of unusual value, Class A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment, serving Holmesville, Ohio, as an off-route point in connection with carrier's regular route operations between Toledo, Ohio, and Pittsburgh, Pa.

HEARING: April 14, 1960, at the New Post Office Building, Columbus, Ohio, before Joint Board No. 117, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Hugh M. Nicholson.

No. MC 11185 (Sub No. 117), filed January 22, 1960. Applicant: J-T TRANSPORT COMPANY, INC., 3501 Manchester Trafficway, Kansas City, Mo. Applicant's attorney: James W. Wrape, 2111 Sterick Building, Memphis, Tenn. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Aircraft assemblies*, requiring special handling and equipment because of their delicate and fragile nature, from St. Louis, Mo., to Wichita, Kans.

NOTE: Common control may be involved.

HEARING: May 5, 1960, at the Missouri Public Service Commission, Jefferson City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 195.

No. MC 17829 (Sub No. 3), filed February 15, 1960. Applicant: Dr SILVA TRANSPORTATION, INC., 30 Middlesex Avenue, Somerville, Mass. Applicant's attorney: Mary E. Kelley, 10 Tremont Street, Boston 8, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Such merchandise* as is dealt in by wholesale, retail and chain grocery and food business houses, and, in connection therewith, *equipment, materials and supplies* used in the conduct of such business, except commodities in bulk, in tank trucks, from Boston, Mass., to points in Westchester County, N.Y., and points in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, and *returned or damaged shipments* of the above-described commodities, on return.

NOTE: Applicant states duplication with existing authority is to be eliminated; also, that the proposed operations will be conducted under a continuing contract with Stop & Shop, Inc.

HEARING: April 18, 1960, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Examiner Alton R. Smith.

No. MC 29566 (Sub No. 63), filed December 21, 1959. Applicant: SOUTH-

WEST FREIGHT LINES, INC., 1400 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City 5, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Pepper*, ground or not ground (in mixed shipments with salt and related articles, not to exceed ten (10) percent of the total weight of each shipment), from Hutchinson, Kans., and points within one (1) mile thereof, to points in Missouri, except Kansas City, St. Joseph, and St. Louis, Mo. Applicant is authorized to conduct operations in Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, Indiana, Texas, South Dakota, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

NOTE: Applicant states it is under common control with Bulk Motor Transport, Inc., MC 115757.

HEARING: May 9, 1960, at the New Hotel Pickwick, Kansas City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 195.

No. MC 30837 (Sub No. 272) (Republication), filed January 18, 1960, published FEDERAL REGISTER February 10, 1960. Applicant: KENOSHA AUTO TRANSPORT CORPORATION, 4519 76th Street, Kenosha, Wis. Applicant's attorney: Paul F. Sullivan, 1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington 6, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Portable camp coaches* (camp coach bodies designed for installation on pickup trucks), from points in Los Angeles, Orange, and San Bernardino Counties, Calif., to points in the United States, including Alaska, and except those in Hawaii.

HEARING: Remains as assigned, April 18, 1960, at the New Mint Building, 133 Hermann Street, San Francisco, Calif., before Examiner Richard H. Roberts.

No. MC 34534 (Sub No. 1), filed February 15, 1960. Applicant: BEN HUEBNER, Denison, Iowa. Applicant's attorney: Ray B. Johansen, 222 Davidson Building, Sioux City 1, Iowa. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meat, meat products and meat by-products*, as defined in subdivision A of Appendix 1 to the report in *Descriptions in Motor Carriers Certificate*, 61 MCC 209, 272, as modified by the report on reconsideration therein decided, April 6, 1953, 61 MCC 766, from Denison, Iowa, to Chicago and Streator, Ill., and Commercial Zones thereof.

HEARING: May 19, 1960, at the Federal Office Building, Fifth and Court Avenues, Des Moines, Iowa, before Joint Board No. 53.

No. MC 35835 (Sub No. 14), filed November 2, 1959. Applicant: ELMER JENSEN, 513 Ninth Avenue SE., Independence, Iowa. Applicant's representative: William A. Landau, 1307 East Walnut Street, Des Moines 16, Iowa. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Malt beverages*, from La Crosse, Wis., to Waterloo, Iowa, and *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified) used in transporting malt beverages, on return. Applicant is authorized to conduct operations in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas,

Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

HEARING: May 16, 1960, at the Federal Office Building, Fifth and Court Avenues, Des Moines, Iowa, before Joint Board No. 202.

No. MC 44947 (Sub No. 17), filed January 18, 1960. Applicant: DEIOMA TRUCKING CO., a Corporation, P.O. Box 891, Mount Union Station, Alliance, Ohio. Applicant's attorney: John P. McMahon, 44 East Broad Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. Authority sought to operate as a *common or contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Floor and wall tile*, from Canton, Ohio, to points in New Jersey; and (2) *Damaged, rejected or returned shipments* of the above-specified commodities, as well as *pallets, containers and other devices* used in the outbound transportation, from points in New Jersey to Canton, Ohio.

NOTE: Applicant states the proposed transportation is to be performed under a continuing contract or contracts with United States Ceramic Tile Company. A proceeding has been instituted under section 212(c) in No. MC 44947 (Sub No. 14) to determine whether applicant's status is that of a common or contract carrier.

HEARING: April 12, 1960, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner C. Evans Brooks.

No. MC 50069 (Sub No. 223), filed February 23, 1960. Applicant: REFINERS TRANSPORT & TERMINAL CORPORATION, 2111 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Dry commodities*, in bulk (except sand, gravel, cement, coal, and coke), between points in Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia.

HEARING: April 18, 1960, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner James A. McKiel.

No. MC 64820 (Sub No. 2), filed February 8, 1960. Applicant: INDEPENDENT TRUCK LINE, INC., 409 Barnes Street, Medford, Ore. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Pre-cut buildings*, from Josephine and Jackson Counties, Ore., to Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc, Humboldt, Trinity, Shasta, Lassen, Tehama, Mendocino, Sonora, Lake, Napa, Butte, Sutter, Sierra, and Nevada Counties, Calif., and *redwood lumber*, from Del Norte and Humboldt Counties, Calif., to Jackson County, Ore., on return.

HEARING: May 12, 1960, at the Interstate Commerce Commission Hearing Room, 410 Southwest 10th Avenue, Portland, Ore., before Joint Board No. 11 or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner William R. Tyers.

No. MC 79476 (Sub No. 17), filed February 5, 1960. Applicant: YOUNG'S MOTOR TRUCK SERVICE, INC., 10 Grosvenor Street, Taunton, Mass. Applicant's representative: Russell B. Curnett, 49 Weybosset Street, Providence 3, R.I. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Sand, abrasive or foundry, in bulk, in dump-type trucks and dump-type trailers*, from points in Barnstable and Plymouth Counties, Mass., to points in New Hampshire.

HEARING: April 14, 1960, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Joint Board No. 114, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Alton R. Smith.

No. MC 95540 (Sub No. 322) (Correction) filed February 4, 1960, published in FEDERAL REGISTER, issue of February 25, 1960. Applicant: WATKINS MOTOR LINES, INC., Cassidy Road, Thomasville, Ga. Applicant's attorney: Joseph H. Blackshear, Gainesville, Ga. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods, meats, meat products, Meat By-Products and Dairy Products*, as defined by the Commission, from points in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and Massachusetts, to points in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Washington, Oregon, and California.

NOTE: The purpose of the republication is to add *frozen foods* to the list of commodities to be transported, inadvertently omitted from previous publication.

HEARING: Remains as assigned March 30, 1960, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner Leo A. Riegel.

No. MC 95876 (Sub No. 15), filed February 23, 1960. Applicant: ANDERSON TRUCKING SERVICE, INC., 203 Cooper Avenue North, St. Cloud, Minn. Applicant's attorney: Donald A. Morken, 1100 First National-Soo Line Building, Minneapolis 2, Minn. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Granite, stone, marble and slate*, between points in Kansas, Missouri and Oklahoma, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, and Vermont. *Granite, stone, marble and slate and machinery, equipment, materials and supplies* used in or in connection with the quarrying and fabricating and finishing of monumental and structural granite, stone, marble and slate: (1) Between points in Minnesota. (2) The right to use any point in Minnesota as an alternate gateway to other authorized authority.

HEARING: April 1, 1960, in Room 926 Metropolitan Building, Second Avenue, South and Third, Minneapolis, Minn., before Examiner Donald R. Sutherland.

No. MC 99363 (Sub No. 1), filed November 4, 1959. Applicant: ERICKSON TRUCKING SERVICE, INC., 2608 Lake Avenue, North Muskegon, Mich., Applicant's attorney: Kit F. Clardy, Olds Tower, Lansing, Mich. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Heavy machinery and equipment* to be handled on carryall trucks, winch trucks or pole truck equipment, and *empty containers or other such incidental facilities*, between points in an area in Michigan bounded on the north and west by Lake Michigan, on the east by U.S. Highway 131 and on the south by the northern boundary line of Allegan County, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin. Applicant is authorized to conduct operations in Michigan under the second proviso of section 206(a) (1).

HEARING: April 20, 1960, at the Olds Hotel, Lansing, Mich., before Examiner Hugh M. Nicholson.

No. MC 103993 (Sub No. 130), filed February 15, 1960. Applicant: MORGAN DRIVE-AWAY, INC., 500 Equity Building, Elkhart, Ind. Applicant's attorney: John E. Lesow, 3737 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis 8, Ind. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Trailers*, designed to be drawn by passenger automobiles, in initial movements, in truckaway service, from points in Oregon to points in the United States including Alaska, with the exception of from Pendleton, Ore., to points in Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming.

HEARING: May 12, 1960, at the Interstate Commerce Commission Hearing Room, 410 Southwest 10th Avenue, Portland, Oregon, before Examiner William R. Tyers.

No. MC 106271 (Sub No. 6), filed December 28, 1959. Applicant: FRANCIS D. GOOD, Drexel, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Gravel, sand, dirt, lime, and rock*, in bulk, in dump vehicles and lime truck equipment, from points in Bates and Case Counties, Mo., to La Gygne, Kans., and points within twenty (20) miles of La Gygne. Applicant is authorized to conduct operations in Kansas and Missouri.

NOTE: Applicant has authority under MC 106271 (Sub No. 4) to transport Gravel, sand, dirt and limestone, in bulk, from La Gygne, Kans., and points in Kansas within 20 miles thereof, to points in Bates and Case Counties, Mo.

HEARING: May 3, 1960, at the Missouri Public Service Commission, Jefferson City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 36.

No. MC 106398 (Sub No. 149), filed January 25, 1960. Applicant: NATIONAL TRAILER CONVOY, INC., 1916 North Sheridan Road, Tulsa, Okla. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Trailers*, designed to be drawn by passenger automobiles, in initial movements, in truckaway service, from points in Oregon ex-

cept from Pendleton and McNary, to points in the United States, including Alaska.

HEARING: April 15, 1960, at the Interstate Commerce Commission Hearing Room, 410 Southwest 10th Avenue, Portland, Oreg., before Examiner Richard H. Roberts.

No. MC 106965 (Sub No. 137), filed February 16, 1960. Applicant: M. I. O'BOYLE & SON, INC., doing business as O'BOYLE TANK LINES, 1825 Jefferson Place NW., Washington 6, D.C. Applicant's attorney: Dale C. Dillon, 1825 Jefferson Place NW., Washington 6, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Dry commodities* (except sand, gravel, cement, coal, and coke), in bulk, and *rejected shipments* thereof, between points in Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

NOTE: Applicant has pending contract carrier authority under MC 112563 (Sub No. 1). Dual authority under section 210 may be involved.

HEARING: April 18, 1960, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner James A. McKiel.

No. MC 107643 (Sub No. 54), filed November 23, 1959. Applicant: ST. JOHNS MOTOR EXPRESS CO., a Corporation, 7220 North Burlington Avenue, Portland, Oreg. Applicant's attorney: George R. LaBissoniere, 654 Central Building, Seattle 4, Wash. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Dry glue, glue stock, or glue ingredients or additives, synthetic resins*, in bags or barrels, from points in King and Pierce Counties, Wash., to points in Oregon, and *empty containers and rejected shipments*, on return, and (2) *dry glue, glue stock, or glue ingredients or additives, synthetic resins*, in bags or barrels, and *empty containers and rejected shipments*, between points in Multnomah and Washington Counties, Oregon, to points in Washington. Applicant is authorized to conduct operations in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

HEARING: May 5, 1960, at the Federal Office Building, First and Marion Streets, Seattle, Washington, before Joint Board No. 45, or, if the Joint Board waives its rights to participate, before Examiner William R. Tyers.

No. MC 108106 (Sub No. 9), filed February 19, 1960. Applicant: ARMELLINI EXPRESS LINES, a Corporation, Oak and Brewster Roads, Vineland, N.J. Applicant's representative: Jacob Polin, 426 Barclay Building, City Line at Belmont Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *General commodities*, except Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment, from points in and south of Lee, Henry and Palm Beach Counties, Fla., to points in and

north of Hunterdon, Somerset, and Middlesex Counties, N.J., points in and south of Rockland and Westchester Counties, N.Y., including Long Island, and those in Fairfield County, Conn. **RESTRICTION:** The operations to be conducted are limited to traffic having an immediately prior movement by air or water.

HEARING: April 12, 1960, at the U.S. Army Reserve Building, 30 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y., before Examiner Alton R. Smith.

No. MC 109632 (Sub No. 16), filed February 8, 1960. Applicant: LOPEZ TRUCKING, INC., 131 Linden Street, Waltham, Mass. Applicant's attorney: Kenneth B. Williams, 111 State Street, Boston 9, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Sectional gymnasium floors and outdoor board trucks*, uncrated, and *parts and supplies* for the installation thereof, when transported with Sectional gymnasium floors or outdoor board trucks, between Boston, Mass., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in the United States, except those in Alaska and Hawaii.

HEARING: April 20, 1960, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Examiner Alton R. Smith.

No. MC 109637 (Sub No. 143) (correction), filed January 7, 1960, published in FEDERAL REGISTER issue of February 10, 1960. Applicant: SOUTHERN TANK LINES, INC., 4107 Bells Lane, Louisville 11, Ky. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Whiskey*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, between points in Kentucky, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee.

NOTE: The purpose of this republication is to change the word *from* to *between* as shown above.

HEARING: Remains as assigned March 31, 1960, at the Kentucky Hotel, Louisville, Ky., before Examiner Victor C. Swearingen.

No. MC 110080 (Sub No. 3), filed January 8, 1960. Applicant: A. W. CRABTREE, 104 Western Avenue, Decorah, Iowa. Applicant's representative: A. R. Fowler, 2288 University Avenue, St. Paul 14, Minn. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Malt beverages*, from Omaha, Nebr., to Guttenberg, Iowa, and *empty containers* used in transporting the commodities specified in this application on return.

HEARING: May 20, 1960, at the Federal Office Building, Fifth and Court Avenues, Des Moines, Iowa, before Joint Board No. 138.

No. MC 110388 (Sub No. 20), filed November 16, 1959. Applicant: UNION PACIFIC MOTOR FREIGHT COMPANY, a Corporation, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha 2, Nebr. Applicant's attorneys: John J. Burchell, and F. J. Melia, Union Pacific Railroad Company, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha 2, Nebr. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes,

transporting: *General commodities, including Classes A and B explosives*, but excluding those of unusual value, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and commodities requiring special equipment, (1) Between Portland, Oreg., and Seattle, Wash., over U.S. Highway 99. (2) Between Kelso, Wash., and Longview, Wash., over U.S. Highway 830. (3) Between junction U.S. Highway 99 and Washington Highway 12E and Napavine, Wash., over Washington Highway 12E. (4) Between junction U.S. Highway 99 and Washington Highway 1N and Chehalis, Wash., over Washington Highway 1N. (5) Between junction U.S. Highway 99 and Washington Highway 1N and Centralia, Wash., over Washington Highway 1N. (6) Between junction U.S. Highway 410 and Washington Highway 9, near Elma, Wash., and junction Washington Highway 9 and U.S. Highway 99, near Grand Mound, Wash., over Washington Highway 9. (7) Between Olympia, Wash., and Hoquiam, Wash., from Olympia over U.S. Highway 410 to Aberdeen, Wash., thence over U.S. Highway 101 to Hoquiam, and return over the same route. (8) Between Dupont, Wash., and Tacoma, Wash., from Dupont over Washington Highway 5, through Steilacoom, Wash., to Puyallup, Wash., thence over U.S. Highway 410 to Tacoma, and return over the same route. (9) Between Puyallup, Wash., and junction U.S. Highway 99 and Washington Highway 5, near Seattle, Wash., over Washington Highway 5. (10) Between Auburn, Wash., and junction U.S. Highway 99 and Washington Highway 5, over Washington Highway 5. (11) Between Kent, Wash., and junction U.S. Highway 99 and Washington Highway 5A, over Washington Highway 5A. (12) Between Portland, Oreg., and Huntington, Oreg., over U.S. Highway 30. (13) Between Portland, Oreg., and Troutdale, Oreg., (a) from Portland over Alternate U.S. Highway 30 to junction U.S. Highway 30, and thence over U.S. Highway 30 to Troutdale, and return over the same route; (b) from Portland over unnumbered county road, known as Northeast Halsey Street (also known as Barr Road), to Troutdale, and return over the same route. (14) Between Biggs, Oreg., and Kent, Oreg., over U.S. Highway 97. (15) Between Arlington, Oreg., and Condon, Oreg., over Oregon Highway 19. (16) Between Heppner Junction, Oreg., and Heppner, Oreg., over Oregon Highway 74. (17) Between Heppner, Oreg., and Condon, Oreg., from Heppner over Oregon Highway 207 to junction Oregon Highway 206, thence over Oregon Highway 206 to Condon, and return over the same route. (18) Between Pendleton, Oreg., and Pilot Rock, Oreg., over U.S. Highway 395. (19) Between North Powder, Oreg., and junction Oregon Highway 203 and U.S. Highway 30, from North Powder over unnumbered county road to Union, Oreg., thence over Oregon Highway 203 to junction U.S. Highway 30, near La Grande, Oreg. (20) Between La Grande, Oreg., and Joseph, Oreg., over Oregon Highway 82. (21) Between junction U.S. Highway 30 and Oregon Highway 207 approximately five (5) miles east of Ordinance, Oreg., and junction Oregon Highway 207 and U.S.

Highway 395, over Oregon Highway 207. (22) Between junction unnumbered highway and U.S. Highway 30, near Stanfield, Oreg., and junction unnumbered highway and U.S. Highway 730, near Umatilla, Oreg., from junction unnumbered highway and U.S. Highway 30 near Stanfield, over unnumbered highway, through Hermiston, Oreg., to junction U.S. Highway 730, near Umatilla, and return over the same route. (23) Between Umatilla, Oreg., and Yakima, Wash., from Umatilla over U.S. Highway 730 to junction U.S. Highway 410, thence over U.S. Highway 410 to junction unnumbered highway approximately three (3) miles west of Donald, Wash., thence over unnumbered highway to junction Washington Highway 3A, thence over Washington Highway 3A to Union Gap, Wash., and thence over U.S. Highway 410 to Yakima, and return over the same route. (24) Between Prosser, Wash., and junction U.S. Highway 410 and unnumbered highway approximately six (6) miles west of Prosser, Wash., from Prosser over unnumbered highway, through North Prosser, Wash., to junction U.S. Highway 410, and return over the same route. (25) Between Umatilla, Oreg., and Kennewick, Wash., from Umatilla over the Columbia River Bridge to Plymouth, Wash., thence over Washington Highway 8 to Kennewick, and return over the same route, for operating convenience only. (26) Between junction U.S. Highway 410 and unnumbered highway approximately three (3) miles west of Donald, Wash., and Union Gap, Wash., over U.S. Highway 410, for operating convenience only. (27) Between Pendleton, Oreg., and Spokane, Wash., from Pendleton over Oregon Highway 11 to the Oregon-Washington State line, thence over Washington Highway 3E to Walla Walla, Wash., thence over U.S. Highway 410 to Lewiston, Idaho, thence over U.S. Highway 195 to Spokane, and return over the same route. (28) Between Walla Walla, Wash., and Wallula, Wash., over U.S. Highway 410. (29) Between Waitsburg, Wash., and Prescott, Wash., over Washington Highway 3E. (30) Between junction U.S. Highway 410 and Unnumbered County Road and Ayer, Wash., from junction U.S. Highway 410 and unnumbered county road over such unnumbered county road, through Starbuck, Wash., to Ayer, and return over the same route. (31) Between junction U.S. Highway 410 and Washington Highway 3L, near Dayton, Wash., and junction Washington Highway 3L and U.S. Highway 410, near Pomeroy, Wash., over Washington Highway 3L. (32) Between junction U.S. Highways 95 and 195, near Lewiston, Idaho, and Moscow, Idaho, over U.S. Highway 95. (33) Between St. John, Wash., and Steptoe, Wash., over Washington Highway 18. (34) Between Marengo, Wash., and junction Unnumbered County Road and U.S. Highway 195, near Colfax, Wash., from Marengo over unnumbered county road, through Winona, Wash., to junction U.S. Highway 295, thence over U.S. Highway 295 to junction U.S. Highway 195, and return over the same route. (35) Between Pullman, Wash., and junction Washington Highways 3H and 2, near Opportunity,

Wash., from Pullman over Washington Highway 3 to Oakesdale, Wash., thence over Washington Highway 3H to junction Washington Highway 2, and return over the same route. (36) Between Oakesdale, Wash., and junction U.S. Highway 195 and Washington Highway 3, near Rosalia, Wash., over Washington Highway 3. (37) Between junction Washington Highway 3 and Unnumbered County Road and Seltice, Wash., from junction Washington Highway 3 and unnumbered county road, near Belmont, Wash., over such unnumbered county road to Seltice, and return over the same route. (38) Between Plummer, Idaho and Fairfield, Wash., from Plummer over Idaho Highway 5 to the Idaho-Washington State line, thence over unnumbered highway to Fairfield, and return over the same route. (39) Between Spokane, Wash., and Wallace, Idaho over U.S. Highway 10. (40) Between Wallace, Idaho and Burke, Idaho over Idaho Highway 4. (41) Between Spokane, Wash., and Cheney, Wash., over U.S. Highway 395. (42) Between Spokane, Wash., and junction Washington Highway 2H and U.S. Highway 10, near Trentwood, Wash., over Washington Highway 2H. (43) Between Coeur d'Alene, Idaho and Eastport, Idaho over U.S. Highway 95. Serving all intermediate points on the routes described, and all off-route points which are stations on the lines of Union Pacific Railroad Company. The proposed service is subject to the following conditions: (1) The service proposed by applicant shall be limited to service which is auxiliary to or supplemental of the service of Union Pacific Railroad Company; (2) No service shall be rendered to or from any point not a station on the rail lines of Union Pacific Railroad Company; (3) No shipment shall be transported by applicant between any of the following points, or through or to or from more than one of said points: Huntington, Oreg.; Umatilla-Pendleton, Oreg. (considered as one); Portland, Oreg.; Seattle, Wash.; Spokane, Wash.; and Tacoma, Wash. (only on shipments moving from or via Portland to Tacoma, or from or via Tacoma to Portland). (4) All contractual arrangements between the carrier and Union Pacific Railroad Company shall be reported to the Commission and shall be subject to revision by it if and as it may be found necessary in order that such arrangements shall be fair and equitable to the parties. (5) Such further conditions as the Commission, in the future, may find it necessary to impose in order to restrict carrier's operation by motor vehicle to service which is auxiliary to, or supplemental of the rail service of Union Pacific Railroad Company.

NOTE: Applicant states it holds authority in Certificate No. MC 110388 Subs 4, 5, 8, 9 and 14 within the territory covered by this application (set forth on pages 5 and 6 of instant application) subject to rail restrictions, and that authority over the routes covered in Subs 4, 5, 8, 9 and 14 described in the instant application is requested so that the commodity description may be made uniform, and in order that all operations in the area may be made subject to the key-point restrictions set forth above instead of restrictions requiring prior or subsequent

rail movement, now prescribed in Subs 4, 5, 8, 9 and 14. Applicant further states if the authority here sought is granted, applicant is willing that the certificates issued under MC 110388 Subs 4, 5, 8, 9 and 14 be cancelled in order that duplicate authority may be eliminated and its certificates consolidated and simplified.

HEARING: May 16, 1960, at the Interstate Commerce Commission Hearing Room, 410 Southwest 10th Avenue, Portland, Oreg., before Joint Board No. 81, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner William R. Tyers.

No. MC 110563 (Sub No. 12), filed December 28, 1959. Applicant: COLDWAY FOOD EXPRESS, INC., PO Box 259, Sidney, Ohio. Applicant's attorney: Herbert Baker, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Canned mushrooms*, from points in that part of Pennsylvania lying on and south or east of a line beginning at the Pennsylvania-New Jersey state line at Philadelphia, Pa., and extending westward along U.S. Highway 30 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 10 (formerly U.S. Highway 122), and thence southward along Pennsylvania Highway 10 to the Pennsylvania-Maryland state line (excluding Philadelphia, Pa., and other points in Pennsylvania in the Philadelphia Commercial Zone, as defined by the Commission), to points in Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin, and *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified) used in transporting the above-mentioned commodities on return. Applicant is authorized to conduct operations in Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia.

HEARING: April 14, 1960, at the New Post Office Building, Columbus, Ohio, before Examiner Hugh M. Nicholson.

No. MC 112617 (Sub No. 64), filed February 1, 1960. Applicant: LIQUID TRANSPORTERS, INC., P.O. Box 5135, Cherokee Station, Louisville, Ky. Applicant's attorney: Mr. Joseph J. Leary, Mc Clure Building, Louisville 5, Ky. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Coal tar and coal tar products*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from points in Scioto County, Ohio, to points in Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia, and *rejected shipments* on return.

HEARING: April 13, 1960, at the New Post Office Building, Columbus, Ohio, before Examiner Hugh M. Nicholson.

No. MC 113282 (Sub No. 4), filed February 25, 1960. Applicant: CEMENT DISTRIBUTORS, INCORPORATED, 5200 East Marginal Way, Seattle 1, Wash. Applicant's attorneys: W. Quinn Marshall and George H. Hart, Central Building, Seattle 4, Wash. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Cement and pozzolan*, in bulk, between points in Washington.

NOTE: Applicant requests that any duplication with present authority be eliminated. Common control may be involved.

HEARING: April 7, 1960, at the Federal Office Building, First and Marion Streets, Seattle, Wash., before Joint Board No. 80, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Richard H. Roberts.

No. MC 114098 (Sub No. 8), filed February 26, 1960. Applicant: LOWTHER TRUCKING COMPANY, a Corporation, 521 Penman Street, P.O. Box 2115, Charlotte, N.C. Applicant's attorney: Frank A. Graham, Jr., 707 Security Federal Building, Columbia 1, S.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Conduit and pipe*, and (2) *Fittings and attachments* for Item (1); to be transported on flat-bed semi-trailers, from points in Marshall County, W. Va., to points in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, and *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified) used in transporting the commodities specified in this application.

HEARING: April 14, 1960, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner John B. Mealy.

No. MC 114569 (Sub No. 30), filed February 23, 1960. Applicant: SHAFFER TRUCKING, INC., Elizabethville, Pa. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Grass Stop rolls, metal shovels, and building materials* made of sheet metal, from plant site of Penn Supply & Metal Corporation, Philadelphia, Pa., to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Iowa, Michigan, Mississippi, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, Texas, Tennessee, Wisconsin, and West Virginia.

HEARING: April 13, 1960, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner Lacy W. Hinely.

No. MC 115856 (Sub No. 6), filed January 13, 1960. Applicant: TRANSPORT DELIVERY COMPANY, a Corporation, Thompson Building, Tulsa, Okla. Applicant's attorney: John H. Hendren, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Petroleum and petroleum products*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Harrison County, Mo., to points in Iowa.

HEARING: May 9, 1960, at the New Hotel Pickwick, Kansas City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 137.

No. MC 116544 (Sub No. 6), filed February 12, 1960. Applicant: WILSON BROTHERS TRUCK LINE, INC., 700 East Fairview Street, Carthage, Mo. Applicant's attorney: Robert R. Hendon, Investment Building, Washington 5, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Bananas*, in straight and in mixed loads with *exempt agricultural commodities and coconuts*, from Mobile, Ala., Gulfport, Miss., and New Orleans, La., to points in

Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

NOTE: Applicant holds contract carrier authority in Permit No. MC 111290 and Subs thereunder. Dual operations under section 210 may be involved. A proceeding has been instituted under section 212(c) to determine whether applicant's status is that of a contract or common carrier in No. MC 111290 (Sub No. 15).

HEARING: April 13, 1960, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner William E. Messer.

No. MC 117003 (Sub No. 1), filed December 21, 1959. Applicant: PAUL J. BRAY, Box 5201, Orlando, Fla. Applicant's attorney: Richard H. Brandon, Hartman Building, Columbus 15, Ohio. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Glassware and clay products* (other than clay pottery and earthenware), from points in Muskingum County, Ohio, to Shreveport, La., and points in Oklahoma and Texas. (2) *Clay products, glassware, and metal stands for clay products*, (a) from points in Perry County, Ohio, to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas. (b) From points in Muskingum County, Ohio, to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana (except Shreveport), Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina. (3) *Clay pottery, metal stands for clay pottery, clay saggars, earthenware and glassware*, from points in Perry County, Ohio, to points in Florida. (4) *Glassware and clay saggars*, from points in Muskingum County, Ohio, to points in Florida. (5) *Empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified) used in transporting the commodities specified in this application, from the above-described destination points to the above-described origin points, respectively.

HEARING: April 11, 1960, at the New Post Office Building, Columbus, Ohio, before Examiner Hugh M. Nicholson.

No. MC 117386 (Sub No. 3), filed November 23, 1959. Applicant: LEE S. BURRIS, P.O. Box 227, Bradgate, Iowa. Applicant's representative: John M. Ropes, 200 56th Street, Des Moines, Iowa. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Liquid fertilizer*, in bulk, from Humboldt and Dakota City, Iowa, to points in Nebraska located on and east of U.S. Highway 281, and *chemical ingredients used in the manufacture of liquid fertilizer* on return. Applicant is authorized to conduct operations in Iowa and Minnesota.

HEARING: May 20, 1960, at the Federal Office Building, Fifth and Court Avenues, Des Moines, Iowa, before Joint Board No. 138.

No. MC 117427 (Sub No. 12), filed January 4, 1960. Applicant: G. G. PARSONS, doing business as PARSONS TRUCKING COMPANY, P.O. Box 746, North Wilkesboro, N.C. Applicant's attorney: Francis J. Ortman, 1366 National Press Building, Washington 4, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular

routes, transporting: *Lumber*, except plywood and veneer, (1) from points in New York State on and west of U.S. Highway 15, from points in Pennsylvania on and west of U.S. Highway 220 and from points in Ohio, Michigan, West Virginia, and Indiana, to points in North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee. (2) From points in Jones County, N.C., to points in West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, points in New York State on and west of U.S. Highway 15, and points in Pennsylvania on and west of U.S. Highway 220. Applicant is authorized to conduct operations in Florida, Georgia, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

NOTE: Applicant is also authorized to conduct operations as a contract carrier in Permit No. MC 116145, therefore dual operations may be involved.

HEARING: April 12, 1960, at the New Post Office Building, Columbus, Ohio, before Examiner Hugh M. Nicholson.

No. MC 118468 (Sub No. 2), filed January 11, 1960. Applicant: JOE UMTUN AND VIRGIL UMTUN, doing business as UMTUN TRUCKING CO., 910 South Jackson Street, Eagle Grove, Iowa. Applicant's representative: William A. Landau, 1307 East Walnut Street, Des Moines 16, Iowa. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer*, in bulk and in bags, from Joplin and St. Joseph, Mo., and Lawrence, Kans., to points in Iowa.

HEARING: May 17, 1960, at the Federal Office Building, Fifth and Court Avenues, Des Moines, Iowa, before Joint Board No. 55.

No. MC 119088 (Sub No. 2), filed November 25, 1959. Applicant: NORRIS A. FOSTER, Burchard, Nebr. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Agricultural limestone and rock*, in bulk, in dump or spreader type vehicles, from Pawnee City, Nebr., and points within 10 miles thereof, to points in Nemaha and Marshall Counties, Kans., and *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified), used in transporting the above commodities on return.

HEARING: May 13, 1960, at the Nebraska State Railway Commission, Capitol Building, Lincoln, Nebr., before Joint Board No. 19.

No. MC 119247 (Sub No. 1), filed January 28, 1960. Applicant: EARL L. JACKSON, doing business as JACKSON TRUCK LINE, 308 St. Louis Street, West Plains, Mo. Applicant's attorney: Grover C. Hoff, 408 Ridgely Building, Springfield, Ill. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer, and feed*, in bulk and bags, from points in Madison and St. Clair Counties, Ill., to points in Wright, Texas, Shannon, Carter, Oregon, Howell, Ozark, and Douglas Counties, Mo., and points in Sharp, Fulton, Baxter, and Izard Counties, Ark.

HEARING: May 2, 1960, at the Missouri Public Service Commission, Jefferson City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 243.

No. MC 119356, filed January 4, 1960. Applicant: PORK CARRIERS, INC., Route 5, Washington Court House, Ohio. Applicant's attorney: Kline L. Roberts, 150 East Broad Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Dressed hogs and offal*, from Collins Packing Company, Greenfield, Ohio, to points in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Virginia.

HEARING: April 13, 1960, at the New Post Office Building, Columbus, Ohio, before Examiner Hugh M. Nicholson.

No. MC 119394, filed December 30, 1959. Applicant: LEONARD McKEE, doing business as LEONARD McKEE LINES, 10571 West Michigan Avenue, R.F.D. No. 8, Kalamazoo, Mich. Applicant's attorney: J. T. Hammond, 205-10 Gas Building, 170 E. Wall Street, Benton Harbor, Mich. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Waste paper and scrap paper stock*, from points in Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island, to Plainwell, Mich., and points in Kalamazoo County, Mich., and exempt commodities under the provisions of section 203(b) on return.

HEARING: April 21, 1960, at the Olds Hotel, Lansing, Mich., before Examiner Hugh M. Nicholson.

No. MC 119411, filed January 6, 1960. Applicant: MORRIS C. BASTIAN AND HAROLD E. GARRETT, doing business as BASTIAN TRUCK SERVICE, 206 West Davis Street, Monroe City, Mo. Applicant's attorney: Herman W. Huber, Attorney at Law, 101 East High Street, Jefferson City, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Feed and fertilizer*, from East St. Louis, Ill. to points in Monroe, Audrain, Ralls, Pike, Marion, Shelby, Lewis, Knox, Clark, and Scotland Counties, Mo.

HEARING: May 2 1960, at the Missouri Public Service Commission, Jefferson City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 135.

No. MC 119423, filed January 8, 1960. Applicant: WILKEY & LANKFORD, INC., Campbell, Mo. Applicant's attorney: William B. Sharp, 112 East Main Street, Malden, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Commodities in bulk*, by dump truck (road materials), from Campbell, Mo., to points in Clay, Greene, Craighead, and Mississippi Counties, Ark.

NOTE: Applicant states that operations will be to road jobs and contractor's operations in destinations of above-mentioned counties.

HEARING: May 3, 1960, at the Missouri Public Service Commission, Jefferson City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 91.

No. MC 119451, filed January 25, 1960. Applicant: FRED ETHEL, doing business as FRED ETHEL SUPPLY COMPANY, R.D. No. 1, Shiloh, Ohio. Applicant's attorney: Joseph L. Jerger, 100½ North Main Street, Mansfield, Ohio. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Outboard boats and in-*

board boats, between points in Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Delaware, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

HEARING: April 15, 1960, at the New Post Office Building, Columbus, Ohio, before Examiner Hugh M. Nicholson.

No. MC 119454, filed January 25, 1960. Applicant: C & M TRUCKING, INC., 17A Gordon Street, Allston, Mass. Applicant's representative: Arthur A. Wentzell, P.O. Box 720, Worcester 1, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *New automobiles*, namely, busses, chassis, passenger cars, trucks, station wagons, of foreign manufacture, in secondary or subsequent movements, by truckaway service, (1) from Boston, Fall River, and New Bedford, Mass., to points in Massachusetts, and (2) from Bedford, Boston, Fall River, and New Bedford, Mass., to points in Maine, and *damaged, refused and/or repossessed new automobiles*, as specified above, on return.

NOTE: Applicant is authorized to conduct operations as a common carrier under the Second Proviso of section 206(a) (1) in No. MC 120193. Applicant states that in the event the Commission approves the authority sought herein, it will request revocation of the second proviso filing; that it does not wish to operate in a dual capacity of common and contract carrier; and that it will conduct the proposed operations under a continuing contract with Hansen-MacPhee Engineering, Inc., Bedford, Mass.

HEARING: April 14, 1960, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Joint Board No. 69, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Alton R. Smith.

No. MC 119462, filed January 18, 1960. Applicant: G. W. REYNOLDS, doing business as REYNOLDS TRUCK LINE, P.O. Box 123, Clifton Hill, Mo. Applicant's attorney: Herman W. Huber, 101 East High Street, Jefferson City, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Feed and fertilizer*, from points in the East St. Louis, Ill., Commercial Zone, as defined by the Commission, to points in Randolph, Chariton and Howard Counties, Mo., and to Madison in Monroe County, and Boonville in Cooper County, Mo., and *damaged, rejected and returned shipments* of the above-specified commodities, and *livestock and exempt agricultural commodities* on return.

HEARING: May 4, 1960, at the Missouri Public Service Commission, Jefferson City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 135.

No. MC 119462 (Sub No. 1), filed January 18, 1960. Applicant: G. W. REYNOLDS, doing business as REYNOLDS TRUCK LINE, P.O. Box 123, Clifton Hill, Mo. Applicant's attorney: Herman W. Huber, 101 East High Street, Jefferson City, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer*, from Lawrence, Military and Kansas City, Kans., to points in

Randolph, Chariton, and Howard Counties, Mo., and to Madison in Monroe County, and Boonville in Cooper County, Mo., and *damaged, rejected and returned shipments* of the above-specified commodities, and *livestock and exempt agricultural commodities* on return.

HEARING: May 4, 1960, at the Missouri Public Service Commission, Jefferson City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 36.

No. MC 119464, filed January 29, 1960. Applicant: BENJAMIN J. FERGUSON, doing business as FERGUSON HAULING, 1229a Lami Street, St. Louis 4, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Green Hides and salted hides, and empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified) used in transporting the commodities specified in this application, between Alton, Ill., and St. Louis, Mo., over U.S. Highway 67 (also over Alternate U.S. Highway 67).

HEARING: May 5, 1960, at the Missouri Public Service Commission, Jefferson City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 135.

No. MC 119471, filed February 1, 1960. Applicant: FRANKLIN H. EATON, 27 Chapel Street, Calais, Maine. Applicant's attorney: Mary E. Kelley, 10 Tremont Street, Boston 8, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fish, commodities used or useful in the processing and packing of fish, and fishing boat machine parts, supplies and equipment*, between Boston and Gloucester, Mass. and the port of entry on the International Boundary Line between the United States and Canada at or near Calais, Maine.

HEARING: April 13, 1960, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Joint Board No. 69, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Alton R. Smith.

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PASSENGERS

No. MC 675 (Sub No. 2), filed February 15, 1960. Applicant: CLYDE B. ALEXANDER, doing business as A. & M. TRANSIT LINES, 1652 South Morgan Avenue, Alliance, Ohio. Applicant's attorney: Robert N. Krier, 3430 LeVeque-Lincoln Tower, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus 15, Ohio. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, in round trip charter operations, beginning and ending at points in Summit, Portage, and Stark Counties, Ohio, and extending to New York, N.Y.

NOTE: In Certificate No. MC 675 applicant holds, among other authority, authority to transport passengers and their baggage, in round-trip charter operations beginning and ending at points in Summit, Stark, and Portage Counties, Ohio, and extending to the District of Columbia, Alexandria, Va., and points in Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va., with no pick-up or discharge of passengers en route. Applicant states as follows: The present proposal would authorize the same type of operations between the same Ohio counties and New York City. If this application is granted, applicant, in addition to round trip operations between points in the

named Ohio counties and New York City would also accept charters for round trips from points in the three Ohio counties to the District of Columbia, Fairfax and Arlington Counties, Va., thence to New York City and return to the three named Ohio counties. Applicant does not propose to pick up or discharge passengers en route, except that on round trip charters between the named base Ohio counties and New York City in conjunction with round trip charter operations under present authority between such Ohio counties and the District of Columbia and Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va., passengers would disembark in the District of Columbia and the named Virginia Counties and disembark in New York City. If this application is granted, it will be acceptable to the applicant to consolidate authority herein sought with its presently existing charter authority in Certificate No. MC 675.

HEARING: April 15, 1960, at the New Post Office Building, Columbus, Ohio, before Joint Board No. 330, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Hugh M. Nicholson.

No. MC 119254, filed October 12, 1959. Applicant: GEORGE GROSS, 1423 West Lexington, Independence, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Passengers* and their baggage, in round-trip operations, beginning and ending at Independence, Mo., and extending to points on the International Boundary line between the United States and Mexico.

NOTE: Applicant states it is proposed to transport students of archaeology to archaeological sites.

HEARING: May 10, 1960, at the New Hotel Pickwick, Kansas City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 334.

APPLICATIONS IN WHICH HANDLING WITHOUT ORAL HEARING IS REQUESTED

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PROPERTY

No. MC 25153 (Sub No. 9), filed February 29, 1960. Applicant: MARTIN FREIGHT SERVICE, INC., 100 Frick Avenue, Waynesboro, Pa. Applicant's representative: Donald E. Freeman, Uniontown Road, Box 24, Westminster, Md. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Machinery and machinery parts*, and *worn and damaged machinery*, for repair, in truckloads, between Waynesboro, Pa., on the one hand, and on the other, points in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

No. MC 30319 (Sub No. 111), filed February 18, 1960. Applicant: SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRANSPORT COMPANY, a corporation, 810 North San Jacinto Street, P.O. Box 4054, Houston, Tex. Applicant's attorney: Edwin N. Bell, 1600 Esperson Building, Houston 2, Tex. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities*, except those of unusual value, dangerous explosives, household goods as defined in 17 MC-C-467, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment, between Lake Arthur, La., and Gilbert's Landing, La.,

over Louisiana Highway 717, a distance of approximately seven (7) miles.

NOTE: Applicant states authority sought is to serve Gilbert's Landing, La., as an off-rail point in connection with regular route operations between Gueydan and Lake Arthur, La., over Louisiana Highway 14. Applicant advises it is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Southern Pacific Company and is affiliated with Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, also wholly owned by the Southern Pacific Company.

No. MC 66562 (Sub No. 1642), filed February 29, 1960. Applicant: RAILWAY EXPRESS AGENCY, INC., 219 East 42d Street, New York 17, N.Y. Applicant's attorneys: Slovacek and Galliani, Suite 2800, 188 Randolph Tower, Chicago 1, Ill. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over a regular route, transporting: *General commodities, including Classes A and B explosives*, moving in express service, between Algona, Iowa, and Sheldon, Iowa, from Algona over U.S. Highway 18 to Sheldon, and return over the same route, serving the intermediate points of Cylinder, Emmetsburg, Ruthven, Spencer, Hartley, and Sanborn, Iowa, and the off-route points of Whittemore, Dickens, and Everly, Iowa. The application indicates the service to be performed by applicant shall be limited to such as is auxiliary to or supplemental of rail or air express service; and shipments to be transported shall be limited to those moving on a through bill of lading or express receipt.

No. MC 66562 (Sub No. 1643), filed February 29, 1960. Applicant: RAILWAY EXPRESS AGENCY, INC., 219 East 42d Street, New York 17, N.Y. Applicant's attorneys: Slovacek and Galliani, Suite 2800, 188 Randolph Tower, Chicago 1, Ill. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over a regular route, transporting: *General commodities, including Classes A and B explosives*, moving in express service, between Sheldon, Iowa, and Inwood, Iowa, from Sheldon over U.S. Highway 18 to Inwood, and return over the same route, serving the intermediate or off-route points of Boyden, Hull, and Rock Valley, Iowa. The application indicates the service to be performed by applicant shall be limited to such as is auxiliary to or supplemental of rail or air express service. Shipments to be transported shall be limited to those moving on a through bill of lading or express receipt.

No. MC 80382 (Sub No. 26), filed February 16, 1960. Applicant: BROOKS TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, INC., 1301 North Boulevard, Richmond 4, Va. Applicant's attorney: Francis W. McInerney, Commonwealth Building, 1625 K Street NW., Washington 6, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities*, except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment, (1) between Greensboro, N.C., and Gastonia, N.C., from Greensboro over Combined U.S. Highways 29 and 70 (also over Combined

Alternate U.S. Highways 29 and 70 to junction Combined U.S. Highways 29 and 70) to Salisbury, N.C., thence over U.S. Highway 29 (also over Alternate U.S. Highway 29 to Concord, N.C.) to Charlotte, N.C., thence continue over U.S. Highway 29 to Gastonia, and return over the same route, serving the intermediate points of High Point, Salisbury, Concord, Charlotte, and Belmont, N.C., with service at the intermediate points and at Gastonia restricted to shipments transported to, from, or through Danville, Va.; (2) serving Durham, N.C. as an off-route point in connection with applicant's authorized regular route operations between Danville, Va., and Greensboro, N.C., restricted to shipments transported to, from, or through Danville, Va.; (3) between Winston-Salem, N.C., and Greensboro, N.C., from Winston-Salem over U.S. Highway 421 (also over North Carolina Highway 150 to Kernersville, N.C., thence over U.S. Highway 421) to Greensboro, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, for operating convenience only; (4) between Winston-Salem, N.C., and High Point, N.C., over U.S. Highway 311, serving no intermediate points, for operating convenience only; and (5) between Winston-Salem, N.C., and junction U.S. Highway 52 and Combined U.S. Highways 29 and 70 near Lexington, N.C., over U.S. Highway 52, serving no intermediate points, but serving the said junction for joinder purposes only, for operating convenience only.

NOTE: Applicant states that the instant application is for the purpose of converting irregular-route authority to regular-route authority, and that authority is not sought to provide any service not presently authorized as irregular-route authority.

No. MC 107496 (Sub No. 155), filed February 23, 1960. Applicant: RUAN TRANSPORT CORP., 408 Southeast 30th Street, Des Moines, Iowa. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Liquid synthetic resin*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Valley Park, Mo., to Memphis, Tenn., and Des Moines, Iowa.

No. MC 119530, filed February 23, 1960. Applicant: CLARENCE MAY AND SCOTT PEARSON, doing business as MAY TRUCKING CO., P.O. Box 398, Payette, Idaho. Applicant's attorney: Kenneth G. Bell, 203 McCarty Building, Boise, Idaho. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Prefabricated buildings*, unassembled and knocked down and their component parts and fittings, from Ontario, Oreg., to points in Idaho south of Salmon River, and *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified) used in transporting the above-described commodities on return.

NOTE: A proceeding has been instituted under section 212(c) to determine whether applicant's status is that of a common or contract carrier in No. MC 106871 (Sub No. 4). Applicant also has contract carrier authority under MC 106871 and Subs thereunder; therefore dual operations may be involved.

No. MC 119532, filed February 25, 1960. Applicant: IRA FARRELL AND LAUREL E. FARRELL, doing business as IRA FARRELL & SON, 12 Starrett Street, Houlton, Maine. Applicant's attorney: Kenneth B. Williams, 111 State Street, Boston 9, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Bananas, fresh fruit, fresh vegetables and fresh berries*, from Boston, Mass., to ports of entry at or near Calais, Houlton, and Vanceboro, Maine. On return trips, except commodities, namely, fresh vegetables will be transported.

NOTE: The fresh fruit, vegetables and berries will be on the same vehicle with bananas. The shipments are destined to points in New Brunswick, Canada.

No. MC 119537, filed February 26, 1960. Applicant: MIDLAND SUPERIOR EXPRESS, LIMITED, 1111 42d Avenue SE., Calgary, Alberta, Canada. Applicant's attorney: Donald A. Morken, 1100 First National-Soo Line Building, Minneapolis 2, Minn. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities, including those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk and those requiring special equipment*, in Montana: (1) between Sweetgrass and Shelby over U.S. Highway 91, (2) between Shelby and the Montana-North Dakota State line over U.S. Highway 2, (3) between Wolf Point and Circle over Montana Highway 13, (4) between Circle and Glendive over Montana Highway 20S, and (5) between Glendive and the Montana-North Dakota State line over U.S. Highway 10; in North Dakota: (1) between the Montana-North Dakota State line and the North Dakota-Minnesota State line over U.S. Highway 2, (2) between the boundary line between the United States and Canada at Portal, and Jamestown, over U.S. Highway 52, (3) between the said boundary line, near Pembina, and Fargo, over U.S. Highway 81, and (4) between the Montana-North Dakota State line and the North Dakota-Minnesota State line (at Fargo), over U.S. Highway 10; in Minnesota: (1) between the Canadian-United States border at Noyes, and Crookston, over U.S. Highway 75, (2) between Erskine and Detroit Lakes over U.S. Highway 59, (3) between East Grand Forks and the Minnesota-Wisconsin State line (Duluth), over U.S. Highway 2, (4) between the North Dakota-Minnesota State line (Moorhead) and Minneapolis-St. Paul over U.S. Highway 10, (5) between Minneapolis-St. Paul and the Minnesota-Wisconsin State line over U.S. Highway 12, and (6) between the North Dakota-Minnesota State line (Moorhead) and the Minnesota-Iowa State line, over U.S. Highway 52; in Iowa: (1) between the Minnesota-Iowa State line and Dubuque, over U.S. Highway 52; in Wisconsin: (1) between the Minnesota-Wisconsin State line (Superior), and the Wisconsin-Michigan State line over U.S. Highway 2, (2) between the Minnesota-Wisconsin State line (Hudson), and the Wisconsin-Illinois State line over U.S. Highway 12, (3) between Madison and the Wisconsin-

Illinois State line over U.S. Highway 14, and (4) U.S. Highway 51 between junction U.S. Highway 14 (near Janesville), and the Wisconsin-Illinois State line and junction with U.S. Highway 90; in Illinois: (1) between the Iowa-Illinois State line and the Illinois-Indiana State line (Chicago area), over U.S. Highway 20, (2) between the Wisconsin-Illinois State line and Chicago over U.S. Highway 14, (3) between the Wisconsin-Illinois State line and the Illinois-Indiana State line over U.S. Highway 12, and (4) U.S. Highway 90 between the Wisconsin-Illinois State line and Chicago; in Indiana: (1) between the Illinois-Indiana State line (Gary) and the Indiana-Michigan State line over U.S. Highway 12, (2) between the Illinois-Indiana State line (Gary area), and Angola, over U.S. Highway 20, and (3) between Angola and the Indiana-Michigan State line over U.S. Highway 27; in Michigan: (1) between the Wisconsin-Michigan State line (near Ironwood), and the Canadian-United States Border (Sault Ste. Marie), over U.S. Highway 2, (2) between St. Ignace and Clare over U.S. Highway 27, (3) between Clare and Flint over U.S. Highway 10, (4) between junction U.S. Highway 10 and Michigan Highway 20, and Bay City, over Michigan Highway 20, (5) between Bay City and Flint over U.S. Highway 23, (6) between the Indiana-Michigan State line and the Canadian-United States border (Detroit-Windsor), over U.S. Highway 12, (7) between Springfield and Flint over Michigan Highway 78, (8) between Niles and Jackson over Michigan Highway 60, (9) between the Illinois-Michigan State line and the Canadian-United States boundary line (Detroit-Windsor) over U.S. Highway 112, (10) between the Indiana-Michigan State line at U.S. Highway 27, over said Highway, and Charlotte, (11) between Flint and the Canadian-United States boundary line (Sarnia) over Michigan Highway 21, (12) between Wakefield, and junction of U.S. Highway 2 (just south of Sault Ste. Marie) and Michigan Highway 28, over Michigan Highway 28, and (13) between junction Michigan Highways 117 and 28, south over Michigan Highway 117 to its junction with U.S. Highway 2 (near Engardine), serving no intermediate points on the above-specified routes.

NOTE: Applicant states it is a Canadian carrier holding authority from Canadian provincial boards to transport general commodities without exception over regular routes to and from points in Eastern and Western Canada via Canadian and American highways. Applicant states it serves no points in the United States and does not seek authority to do so in this application; however, authority is sought to traverse the proposed routes, or any combination thereof, with no service to intermediate points. It states that said routes are necessary as some of the merchandise transported by applicant between Eastern and Western Canada has its origin or destination in the United States; that is, traffic is interlined in Eastern Canada with carriers serving between Eastern Canada and the United States.

No. MC 119542, filed February 29, 1960. Applicant: JAMES E. ANDERSON, doing business as UNION GARAGE, 730 Cutting Boulevard, Richmond, Calif. Appli-

cant's representative: Pete H. Dawson, P.O. Box 1007, 1261 Drake Avenue, Burlingame, Calif. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Automobiles*, in secondary movements, in driveway service, from the site of the Travis Air Force Base, near Fairfield, Calif., to Richmond, Calif. The application is accompanied by a Motion to Dismiss.

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PASSENGERS

No. MC 1501 (Sub No. 184). Filed February 29, 1960. Applicant: THE GREYHOUND CORP., 140 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 3, Ill. Applicant's attorney: Earl A. Bagby, Western Greyhound Lines (Div. of The Greyhound Corporation), Market and Fremont Streets, San Francisco 5, Calif. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, and *express and newspapers* in the same vehicle with passengers, between Holt Avenue Junction, Pomona, Calif., and Euclid Avenue Junction, Ontario, Calif., as follows: establish a new regular route between junction U.S. Highway 60 and Holt Avenue, west of Pomona, "Holt Avenue Junction", and junction Euclid Avenue and U.S. Highway 60 in Ontario, "Euclid Avenue Junction", over streets locally designated as Holt and Euclid Avenues, hereinafter referred to as an unnumbered highway, to be described on Sheet 48 of Certificate MC 1501 (Sub No. 138) as Route 258-A.

NOTE: Applicant states the authority sought is between the points and in both directions over the routes hereinabove set forth, serving all intermediate points; that the proposed route is requested in order that applicant's interstate schedules serving Pomona and Ontario (presently served by diversion from U.S. 60, in authorized Route 258), may avoid crossing the Southern Pacific Company's and Union Pacific Company's railroad tracks that parallel each other through the area here concerned.

PETITION

No. MC 33900 (TAKRAB BUS CO., INC.'S AND MATTHEWS CHARTER SERVICE INC.'S PETITION FOR MODIFICATION AND/OR CLARIFICATION OF CERTIFICATE), dated February 9, 1960. Petitioner: TAKRAB BUS COMPANY, INC., 29 West 44th Street, Bayonne, N.J. Petitioner's attorney: S. Harrison Kahn, 1110-1114 Investment Building, Washington 5, D.C. A Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity was issued to Takrab Bus Company, Inc., on April 21, 1942, and authorized the transportation of: "Passengers and their baggage, restricted to traffic originating in the territory indicated, in charter operations, over irregular routes, from points and places in Hudson County, New Jersey to New York, New York, and points and places in Rockland and Westchester Counties, New York, and return." By application under Section 212(b) of the Act, Matthews Charter Service, Inc., Cambridge, Md., seeks to purchase the above-described operating authority of Takrab Bus Company, Inc. This proceeding has been assigned Docket No. MC-FC 62595. Petitioner prays that the Interstate Commerce Commission will

modify the Certificate issued to Takrab Bus Company, Inc., in Docket No. MC-33900 by the elimination of the phrase "restricted to traffic originating in the territory indicated"; or interpret said Certificate to authorize Takrab Bus Company, Inc., to interline traffic, and thus enable Matthews Charter Service, Inc., to consolidate said Certificate with its existing authority, upon Commission approval of the purchase transaction in Docket No. MC-62595; and issue such further order or orders as may be deemed necessary in the premises. Any person or persons desiring to participate in this proceeding may make representations for or against the relief sought within 30 days from the date of this publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OR PERMITS WHICH ARE TO BE PROCESSED CONCURRENTLY WITH APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 5, GOVERNED BY SPECIAL RULE 1.240 TO THE EXTENT APPLICABLE

MOTOR CARRIER OF PROPERTY

No. MC 84212 (Sub No. 24), filed February 26, 1960. Applicant: DORN'S TRANSPORTATION, INC., First Avenue, Rensselaer, N.Y. Applicant's attorney: John J. Brady, Jr., 75 State Street, Albany 7, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities*, except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment, within the State of New York, as follows: (1) Between Buffalo and Albany, (a) from Buffalo over New York Highway 5 to Albany, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points, and the off-route points of Akron, Oakfield, Elba, Verona, Marcy, and Brewerton. (b) From Buffalo over New York Highway 130 to junction U.S. Highway 20, thence over U.S. Highway 20 to Albany, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points, and the off-route points of Attica and Alexander. (2) Between Buffalo and Falconer, from Buffalo over New York Highway 62 to junction U.S. Highway 20, thence over U.S. Highway 20 to Westfield, thence over New York Highway 17, through Jamestown, to Falconer, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points, and the off-route point of Dunkirk. (3) Between Buffalo and Jamestown, from Buffalo over U.S. Highway 62 to Jamestown, and return over the same route, serving the intermediate point of North Collins. (4) Between Waterloo and Ithaca, from Waterloo over New York Highway 96 to Ithaca, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points. (5) Between Syracuse and Ithaca, from Syracuse over U.S. Highway 11 to Cortland, thence over New York Highway 13 to Ithaca, and return over the same route, serving the intermediate points of Cortland and Dryden, and the off-route point of Groton. (6) Between Utica and Norwich, from Utica over New York Highway 12 to Norwich, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points. (7) Between Buffalo and Rochester, from

Buffalo over New York Highway 33 to Rochester, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points, and the off-route point of Cold Water. (8) Between Buffalo and Niagara Falls, from Buffalo over both New York Highways 384 and 266 to Niagara Falls, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points. (9) Between Buffalo and Plattsburg, from Buffalo over New York Highway 263 to Lockport, thence over New York Highway 31 to Rochester, thence over U.S. Highway 104 to Maple View, thence over U.S. Highway 11 to Chateaugay, thence over New York Highway 374 to junction New York Highway 3, and thence over New York Highway 3 to Plattsburg, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points, and the off-route points of Fulton, Hilton, Sackets Harbor, Keeseville, Hamlin, Greece, North Rose, Norfolk, Ellenburg, and Peru. (10) Between Watertown and Malone, from Watertown over New York Highway 37 to Malone, and return over the same route, serving the intermediate points of Hammond, Ogdensburg, and Massena, and the off-route point of Alexandria Bay. (11) Between Watertown and Saranac Lake, from Watertown over New York Highway 3 to Saranac Lake, and return over the same route, serving the intermediate point of Black River, Great Bend, Carthage, and Tupper Lake. (12) Between Rochester and Syracuse, from Rochester over New York Highway 31 to Weedsport, thence over New York Highway 31B to junction New York Highway 5, thence over New York Highway 5 to Syracuse, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points. (13) Between Utica and Watertown, from Utica over New York Highway 12 to Watertown, and return over the same route, serving the intermediate points of Boonville and Lowville. (14) Between Watertown and Cape Vincent, from Watertown over New York Highway 12E to Cape Vincent, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points, and the off-route point of Dexter. (15) Between Watertown and Clayton, from Watertown over New York Highway 12 to Clayton, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points. (16) Between Utica and Schenectady, from Utica over New York Highway 5S to Schenectady, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points. (17) Between Mayville and Jamestown, from Mayville over New York Highway 17J to Jamestown, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points. (18) Between Geneva and Romulus, from Geneva over New York Highway 96A to Romulus, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points. This application is directly related to Docket No. MC-F 7459 published in the March 2, 1960 issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER.

APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTIONS 5 AND 210a(b)

The following applications are governed by the Interstate Commerce Commission's special rules governing notice of filing of applications by motor carrier of property or passengers under section 5(a) and 210a(b) of the Interstate Com-

merce Act and certain other proceedings with respect thereto. (49 CFR 1.240.)

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PROPERTY

No. MC-F 7457 (correction) published in the March 2, 1960, issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER on page 1860. Notice, as corrected, republished in full. Authority sought (1) for merger into THE PITTSTON COMPANY, 250 Park Avenue, New York 17, N.Y., of the operating rights and property of BRINK'S, INCORPORATED (BRINK'S ILLINOIS), 234 East 24th Street, Chicago 16, Ill., (2) for the acquisition by BRINK'S ARMORED, INCORPORATED (BRINK'S DELAWARE), 234 East 24th Street, Chicago 16, Ill., immediately following the merger in (1), from THE PITTSTON COMPANY of the operating rights and property of BRINK'S ILLINOIS, (3) for the purchase by BRINK'S DELAWARE of the "armored car" operating rights, summarized below, of UNITED STATES TRUCKING CORPORATION, 66 Murray Street, New York, N.Y., and (4) for the acquisition by THE PITTSTON COMPANY of control of BRINK'S DELAWARE and of the operating rights and property through the transaction. Applicants' attorneys: David Teitelbaum, 2 Wall Street, New York 5, N.Y., Edward K. Wheeler, Southern Building, Washington, D.C., and Robert S. Foster, 33 North LaSalle Street, Chicago 2, Ill. BRINK'S DELAWARE is a new corporation and not a carrier. Operating rights to be acquired: (a) of BRINK'S ILLINOIS, *coin, currency, negotiable and non-negotiable instruments and securities, precious metals, jewelry, precious stones, monies, legal tender, stocks and bonds, postage and revenue stamps, other valuable documents and rare objects and articles, securities, and bullion*, as a *contract carrier* over irregular routes, from, to or between points and areas varying with the commodity transported, in the District of Columbia, Maryland, Illinois, Iowa, Ohio, Pennsylvania, California, Nevada, Kentucky, Delaware, Michigan, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Missouri, Kansas, New Jersey, New York, West Virginia, Rhode Island, Virginia, Wisconsin, Georgia, Tennessee, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Washington, Oregon, Montana, Utah, Colorado, Texas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Minnesota, Arkansas, and North Carolina; (b) of UNITED STATES TRUCKING CORPORATION, *money, coin, bullion, precious metals and stones, jewelry, stamps, narcotics, negotiable and non-negotiable instruments and securities, stocks, bonds, and rare and valuable documents and objects*, as a *contract carrier* over irregular routes, between points in Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. Control of BRINK'S ILLINOIS and UNITED STATES TRUCKING CORPORATION by THE PITTSTON COMPANY was authorized in MC-F 6544, consummated May 20, 1959. Application has not been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

No. MC-F 7462. Authority sought for purchase by J. M. BLYTHE, doing

business as J. M. BLYTHE MOTOR LINES, P.O. Box 489, 2939 Orlando Drive, Sanford, Fla., of the operating rights of SEABOARD FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 4550 West Colonial Drive, P.O. Box 205, Orlando, Fla. Applicants' attorney: Harry F. Gillis, 919 18th Street NW., Suite 226, Washington 6, D.C. Operating rights sought to be transferred: *Frozen foods, poultry, dressed, fresh or frozen, frozen fruits, frozen vegetables, grape juice, grape juice concentrate, chilled or frozen, frozen citrus products, shrimp cocktail, chilled or frozen, dairy products, frozen eggs, frozen fruit juices, frozen citrus juice concentrate, the commodities classified as (a) meats, meat products, and meat by-products, in the appendix to the report in Modification of Permits—Packing House Products, 48 M.C.C. 628, in vehicles equipped for mechanical refrigeration, fresh fruits and vegetables, fresh meats, dressed rabbits, seafoods, frozen foods, clay products, canned fruit juices, wine, and citrus products, not canned or frozen, in vehicles equipped with mechanical refrigeration, as a common carrier over irregular routes, from, to or between points and areas, varying with the commodity transported, in Maryland, Mississippi, New York, Pennsylvania, Alabama, Florida, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, Louisiana, Georgia, Virginia, Massachusetts, Ohio, Connecticut, Delaware, Rhode Island, Illinois, Indiana, West Virginia, Tennessee, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and the District of Columbia.* The service authorized in Certificate No. MC 114413 is subject to the following restrictions: (1) The service described therein is restricted against the transportation of traffic to or from points in Kent and Sussex Counties, Del., and Somerset, Wicomico, Dorchester, Talbot, Carolina, Queen Annes, and Kent Counties, Md., (2) no operating right therein authorized shall be tacked or combined with any operating right held by carrier in Dockets Nos. MC 114413 Subs 1 and 2 for the purpose of transporting shipments between points herein authorized to be served, on the one hand, and, on the other, points which carrier is authorized to serve in the above-mentioned dockets, and (3) the authority granted therein, to the extent it duplicates any authority heretofore granted to or now held by said carrier shall not be construed as conferring more than one operating right. Vendee is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in Florida, Virginia, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and the District of Columbia. Application has been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

No. MC-F 7463. Authority sought for purchase by WILLIAM HAROLD HUSTON, doing business as HUSTON TRUCK LINE, 219 Maple Street, Friend, Nebr., of a portion of the operating rights of HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, 1200 West 23d Street, Box 168, Fremont, Nebr. Applicants' attorney: James E. Ryan, 214 Sharp Building, Lincoln, Nebr. Operating rights sought

to be transferred: *Livestock and poultry feeds, tonics, and medicines, dry earth paint, mineral feeds and insecticides, and printed advertising matter and premiums, used solely in connection with the sale of mineral feeds and insecticides, as a contract carrier over irregular routes, from Quincy, Ill., to certain points in Nebraska; rejected shipments of the above-specified commodities, and meat scrap, tankage, blood, alfalfa, alfalfa meal, and grain and grain products, from certain points in Nebraska to Quincy, Ill.* Vendee is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and Texas. Application has been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

No. MC-F 7464. Authority sought for purchase by BROWN'S EXPRESS, INC., 221 West Division Street, Syracuse 8, N.Y., of the operating rights and property of DANIEL H. VAN GALDER, doing business as WELCH EXPRESS LINES, R.D. No. 3, West Road, Cortland, N.Y., and for acquisition by GEORGE W. BROWN, also of Syracuse, of control of such rights and property through the purchase. Applicants' attorney: Norman M. Pinsky, 407 South Warren Street, Syracuse 2, N.Y. Operating rights sought to be transferred: *General commodities, excepting, among others, household goods and commodities in bulk, as a common carrier over a regular route between Elmira, N.Y., and Cortland, N.Y., serving all intermediate points and the off-route points of Freeville, Homer, and McGraw, N.Y.; operations under the Second Proviso of section 206(a)(1), Interstate Commerce Act, covering the transportation of general commodities between Cortland, N.Y., and Elmira, N.Y., via New York Highways 13 and 14, serving all intermediate and certain off-route points.* Vendee is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in New York, also under the Second Proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act in the State of New York. Application has not been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

No. MC-F 7465. Authority sought for purchase by DON H. HAWKEY, doing business as HAWKEY TRANSPORTATION, Athens and Locust Streets, P.O. Box 229, Redding, Calif., of a portion of the operating rights of WINANS BROS. TRUCKING CO., 212 Locust Street, P.O. Box 933, Redding, Calif. Applicants' attorney: Marvin Handler, 625 Market Street, San Francisco 5, Calif. Operating rights sought to be transferred: *Construction machinery and equipment, and agricultural machinery, as a common carrier over irregular routes, between points in Butte, Shasta, and Tehama Counties, Calif.; mining and construction machinery and equipment, lumber, poles, cyanide, and building materials, between points in Shasta, Tehama, Trinity, and Siskiyou Counties, Calif.* Vendee is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in California. Application has not been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

No. MC-F 7466. Authority sought for merger into CENTRAL MOTOR LINES,

INCORPORATED, 124 East Sixth Street, P.O. Box 1067, Charlotte 1, N.C., of the operating rights and property of TERMINAL TRANSFER, INC., Bloomfield Avenue, Allwood Station, Clifton, N.J., and for acquisition by ROBERT G. HAYES and MARIAM C. HAYES, both of 60 North Spring Street, Concord, N.C., of control of such rights and property through the transaction. Applicants' attorney: Nuel D. Belnap, One North LaSalle Street, Chicago 2, Ill. Operating rights sought to be merged: *General commodities, excepting, among others, household goods and commodities in bulk, as a common carrier over irregular routes, between points in Passaic, Bergen, Morris, Union, Hudson, Essex, Middlesex, Somerset, and Monmouth Counties, N.J., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Richmond, Bronx, New York, Kings, Queens, and Nassau Counties, N.Y., and between points in the above-named New Jersey counties.* Vendee is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in Illinois, North Carolina, Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, Indiana, New York, South Carolina, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Georgia, and the District of Columbia. Application has not been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

No. MC-F 7468. Authority sought for purchase by ST. CROIX TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, INC., 1015 North Third Street, Minneapolis, Minn., of the operating rights and certain property of G. O. ABRAHAM, doing business as C. & L. MOTOR FREIGHT, 201 Plum Street, Ellsworth, Wis., and for acquisition by WIDHOLM FREIGHTWAYS, INC., and, in turn, HAROLD GROSSER, CHESTER WIDHOLM, ROBERT WIDHOLM, JR., DOROTHY WIDHOLM and RICHARD WIDHOLM, all of 1015 North Third Street, Minneapolis, Minn., of control of such rights and property through the purchase. Applicants' attorney: Leonard E. Lindquist, 1010 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. Operating rights sought to be transferred: *General commodities, excepting, among others, household goods and commodities in bulk, as a common carrier over regular routes, between Minneapolis, Minn., and Durand, Wis., serving all intermediate points in Wisconsin, and the intermediate and off-route points of St. Paul, South St. Paul, and Newport, Minn., and Eau Galle, Wis., between Ellsworth, Wis., and Spring Valley, Wis., serving all intermediate points, and the off-route points of Olivet and El Paso, Wis., and between Elmwood, Wis., and junction unnumbered highway and U.S. Highway 10 near Durand, Wis., serving the intermediate point of Eau Galle, Wis.; service is authorized to and from (1) points in the Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., Commercial Zone, as defined by the Commission, and also Scotchlight, Minn., as intermediate or off-route points in connection with said carrier's presently-authorized regular route operations to or from Minneapolis and St. Paul, restricted to the transportation of such commodities as said carrier is presently authorized to transport to or from Minneapolis or St. Paul over regular routes, and (2) points in the said commercial zone*

and Scotchlite, in lieu of Minneapolis and St. Paul, whichever is presently authorized to be served by said carrier over irregular routes, restricted to the transportation of such commodities as said carrier is presently authorized to transport to or from Minneapolis or St. Paul, over irregular routes. Vendee is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in Minnesota, Wisconsin and Iowa. Application has been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PASSENGERS

No. MC-F 7467. Authority sought for control by TRANSCONTINENTAL BUS SYSTEM, INC., 315 Continental Avenue, Dallas 7, Tex., of DENVER-COLORADO SPRINGS-PUEBLO MOTOR WAY, INC., 1669 Broadway, Denver 2, Colo., and DENVER - SALT LAKE - PACIFIC STAGES, INC., 313 Travel Center Building, 17th and Broadway, Denver, Colo. Applicant's attorneys: Carl B. Callaway, Alfred Crager and Warren A. Goff, all of 315 Continental Avenue, Dallas 7, Tex. Operating rights sought to be controlled: (DENVER-COLORADO SPRINGS-PUEBLO MOTOR WAY, INC.) *Passengers and their baggage, and express, newspapers, and mail, in the same vehicle with passengers, as a common carrier over regular routes, between Denver, Colo., and Trinidad, Colo., between Canon City, Colo., and La Junta, Colo., between Walsenburg, Colo., and Alamosa, Colo., between junction Colorado Highway 115 and U.S. Highway 85, near Colorado Springs, Colo., and junction Colorado Highway 115 and U.S. Highway 50, near Florence, Colo., and between junction U.S. Highway 85 and relocated U.S. Highway 85 approximately 24 miles south of Pueblo, Colo., and junction of those highways approximately 34 miles south of Pueblo, serving all intermediate points and the off-route point of La Veta, Colo.; alternate routes for operating convenience only between junction U.S. Highway 85 and relocated U.S. Highway 85, near Larkspur, Colo., and junction U.S. Highway 85 and relocated U.S. Highway 85 near Monument, Colo., and between Denver, Colo., and Castle Rock, Colo.; authority to engage in operations as a broker at Denver, Colorado Springs, and Pueblo, Colo., covering the transportation of passengers and their baggage, and of express and newspapers, in the same vehicle with passengers, between points in the United States; (DENVER-SALT LAKE-PACIFIC STAGES, INC.) *passengers and their baggage, and express and newspapers, in the same vehicle with passengers, as a common carrier, over regular routes, between Denver, Colo., and Salt Lake City, Utah, and between Rangely, Colo., and Artesia, Colo., serving all intermediate points; alternate route for operating convenience only between Denver, Colo., and junction Colorado Highway 20 and U.S. Highway 40. TRANSCONTINENTAL BUS SYSTEM, INC., is authorized to operate as a common carrier in Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Utah, Arizona, Nebraska, Arkansas, Indiana, and Louisiana. Ap-**

plication has not been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

By the Commission.

[SEAL] HAROLD D. McCoy,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2158; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:47 a.m.]

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

PHILIP N. POWERS

Appointee's Statement of Changes of Business Interests

The following statement lists the names of concerns required by subsection 710(b)(6) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Midwest Piping (deletion).
Internuclear Company.
Trans World Airlines.

This amends statement published August 13, 1959 (24 F.R. 6602).

Dated: February 1, 1960.

DR. PHILIP N. POWERS.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2138; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:45 a.m.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

The following material is a portion of the Departmental Manual and the numbering system is that of the Manual. Material that relates solely to internal management has not been included.

Part 210 of the Departmental Manual has been amended by adding a new subdivision, numbered (3) and reading as follows, to 210 DM 1.3A (24 F.R. 1348):

PART 210—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

CHAPTER 1—SECRETARIAL OFFICERS

* * * * *

210.1.3 *Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.* A. The Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife is authorized to:

* * * * *

(3) Exercise the authority delegated to the Secretary by section 2 of Executive Order 10857 relating to the transfer and conveyance to the State of Alaska of certain property owned or held by the United States. This authority shall be exercised with regard to personal property in accordance with such policies, conditions and procedures as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior (see 418 DM 3).

Part 240 has been added to the Departmental Manual and reads as follows:

PART 240—FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

CHAPTER 4—TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO STATE OF ALASKA

240.4.1 *Delegation of authority.* Authority to transfer to the State of Alaska,

without reimbursement, any personal property situated in Alaska and owned or held by the United States in connection with functions performed by the United States in Alaska pursuant to the Alaska Game Law of July 1, 1943, 57 Stat. 301; the act of June 26, 1906, 34 Stat. 478; the act of June 6, 1924, 43 Stat. 465; and the acts amending or supplementing such acts, may be exercised by—

A. The Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife.

B. The Directors of the Bureaus of Commercial Fisheries and Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

C. The Regional Directors, Alaska Region, of the Bureaus of Commercial Fisheries and Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

240.4.2 *Limitations.* A. This authority may not be redelegated.

B. The authority delegated in 240 DM 4.1 shall be exercised in accordance with policies, conditions, and procedures as may be prescribed from time to time by the Secretary (418 DM 3, Transfers to State of Alaska).

ELMER F. BENNETT,

Acting Secretary of the Interior.

MARCH 3, 1960.

[F.R. Doc. 60-2150; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:46 a.m.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

FARRIS LIVESTOCK AUCTION YARD ET AL.

Posted Stockyards

Pursuant to the authority delegated to the Director, Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), on the respective dates specified below it was ascertained that the livestock markets named below were stockyards within the definition of that term contained in section 302 of the act (7 U.S.C. 202) and were, therefore, subject to the act, and notice was given to the owners and to the public by posting notice at the stockyards as required by said section 302.

Name of Stockyard and Date of Posting

CALIFORNIA

Farris Livestock Auction Yard, Santa Rosa: Oct. 21, 1959.

Lancaster Sales Yard, Lancaster: Dec. 1, 1959.

Los Banos Livestock Commission Co., Los Banos: Dec. 1, 1959.

Reed's Livestock Commission Co., Hayward: Nov. 21, 1959.

Rebik Auction Yard, Brawley: Nov. 1, 1959.
S & C Livestock Commission Co., San Jose: Oct. 28, 1959.

Shasta County Livestock Auction Yard, Anderson: Dec. 31, 1959.

KENTUCKY

Carlisle Stock Yards, Carlisle: Dec. 28, 1959.
Muhlenberg County Livestock Market, Inc.,
Greenville: Dec. 29, 1959.
Walton Sales Barn, Walton: Dec. 28, 1959.

MASSACHUSETTS

Northampton Cooperative Auction Ass'n,
Inc., Northampton: Jan. 12, 1960.

MICHIGAN

Howell Livestock Auction, Howell: Jan.
4, 1960.
Trufant Livestock Sales, Trufant: Jan. 14,
1960.

MISSISSIPPI

Lipscomb Commission Company, Como:
Feb. 2, 1960.

MISSOURI

Platte County Sales Company, Platte City:
Jan. 13, 1960.

NEVADA

Elko Livestock Sales, Elko: Jan. 1, 1960.

NEW MEXICO

Pecos Valley Livestock Commission Com-
pany, Inc., Roswell: Feb. 13, 1958.

NORTH CAROLINA

Wake County Livestock Market, Raleigh:
Jan. 5, 1960.

OKLAHOMA

Shattuck Sales Barn, Shattuck: Dec. 31,
1959.

PENNSYLVANIA

Belknap Auction, Inc., Dayton: Feb. 3,
1960.

Eighty Four Auction Sales, Inc., Eighty
Four: Feb. 1, 1960.

Farmer's Tri County Auction, Inc., Scenery
Hill: Feb. 2, 1960.

Fayette Stock Yard Co., Uniontown: Feb.
2, 1960.

Greenville Livestock Market, Inc., Green-
ville: Jan. 15, 1960.

Hickory Auction & Sales, Inc., Hickory:
Feb. 1, 1960.

Pennsylvania Livestock Auction, Inc.,
Waynesburg: Feb. 2, 1960.

The Kennett Auction Co., Kennett Square:
Jan. 29, 1960.

Tri County Auction, Brockway: Feb. 3,
1960.

SOUTH CAROLINA

P. L. Bruce Livestock Company, Green-
ville: Jan. 28, 1960.

TEXAS

Anderson County Commission Co., Inc.,
Palestine: Jan. 20, 1960.

Kernes Livestock Commission Co., Kernes:
Jan. 22, 1960.

San Augustine Livestock Commission Co.,
San Augustine: Jan. 21, 1960.

Trinity County Auction, Inc., Groveton:
Jan. 21, 1960.

VERMONT

Addison County Commission Sale, East
Middlebury: Nov. 20, 1959.

East Thetford Commission Sale, East Thet-
ford: Jan. 3, 1960.

Gallerani's Commission Sale, Inc., Brad-
ford: Jan. 3, 1960.

WASHINGTON

Lynden Auction Market, Lynden: Jan. 18,
1960.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 3d
day of March 1960.

LEE D. SINCLAIR,

*Acting Director, Livestock Division,
Agricultural Marketing Service.*

[F.R. Doc. 60-2153; Filed, Mar. 8, 1960;
8:46 a.m.]

CUMULATIVE CODIFICATION GUIDE—MARCH

A numerical list of parts of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published to date during March. Proposed rules, as opposed to final actions, are identified as such.

3 CFR	Page	14 CFR—Continued	Page	31 CFR	Page
EXECUTIVE ORDERS:		600	1819,	500	1910
Feb. 18, 1870	1949	1938-1940, 1988-1991, 2009-2011	1819,		
Mar. 26, 1881	1949	601	1819,	32 CFR	
June 8, 1901	1867	1938-1940, 1988-1992, 2009-2011	1819,	1	1778
4208	1949	602	1992	2	1783
10868	1927	608	1868	3	1784
		609	1868	5	1784
5 CFR		PROPOSED RULES:		6	1784
6	1928, 2005	507	1839, 1883	7	1784
24	1743	514	1884	8	1786
325	1928	600	1801-	9	1786
6 CFR		1804, 1839, 1956-1965, 2017, 2018		10	1787
331	1905	601	1802-1804,	16	1788
421	1815	1839, 1840, 1960-1965, 2017, 2018		17	1789
443	1816	602	1804, 1805, 1966, 1993	65a	1789
477	2005			888	1944
485	1867, 1868	16 CFR		33 CFR	
7 CFR		13	1819, 1820, 1873, 1875	202	1910
4	1985	17 CFR		205	1910
52	2005	211	1940	36 CFR	
352	1929	250	1942	7	1947
362	1934	270	1865	39 CFR	
718	1743	18 CFR		43	1947
719	1816	154	1943	45	1947
815	2006	19 CFR		94	1947
850	1905, 1906	10	1820	96	1947
914	1935	20 CFR		168	1948
922	1908	401	2011	42 CFR	
933	1936	21 CFR		75	1911
946	1747	27	1770	43 CFR	
953	1817, 1937	120	1943	PROPOSED RULES:	
954	1756	121	1772, 1944	192	1877
965	1763	146a	1909	PUBLIC LAND ORDERS:	
987	1817	281	1820	808	1885, 1950
PROPOSED RULES:		PROPOSED RULES:		1312	1867
53	1913	120	1956, 2017	2058	1867
902	1838	121	1800, 1801, 1884, 1913	2059	1867
904	1879	22 CFR		2060	1949
972	1791	121	1821	2061	1949
990	1879	122	1823	2062	1950
996	1879	123	1824	46 CFR	
999	1879	124	1827	172	1912
1019	1879	125	1827	PROPOSED RULES:	
1021	1954	126	1828	201-380	1955
1065	1955	127	1829	47 CFR	
9 CFR		128	1829	1	1950, 1985
73	1873	25 CFR		3	2012
131	1937, 1938	48	1829	13	1950
155	1763	124	1831	16	1834
12 CFR		26 (1954) CFR		17	1952
204	1818	1	1833, 1954	PROPOSED RULES:	
14 CFR		48	1773	3	1967, 1993, 2019
40	1987	PROPOSED RULES:		49 CFR	
41	1987	1	1954	139	1986
42	1987	30 CFR		145	1837
60	1764, 1987	PROPOSED RULES:		186	1837
302	1868	25	1877		
375	1767	33	2014		
501	1938				
507	1818, 1908, 1987				

7
7
8
7
0
7
7
9
0
2
5
5
2
0
4
2
9
6
7
7



